



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A

872,527

PROPERTY OF
*University of
Michigan
Libraries*

1817

ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

8509.2

VOL. XLVII.

PUBLISHED IN
NOVEMBER 1859, AND FEBRUARY 1860.



LONDON:
THOMAS RICHARDSON AND SON,
147, STRAND; 9, CAPEL STREET, DUBLIN; AND DERBY.
MARSH & BEATTIE, EDINBURGH; HUGH MARGEY, GLASGOW.
NEW YORK: EDWARD DUNIGAN AND BROTHER—BALTIMORE: MURPHY & CO.
MELBOURNE, VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA: MICHAEL T. GASON—
SYDNEY: W. DOLMAN.
PARIS: 22, RUE DE LA BANQUE, STASSIN AND XAVIER.

—
1860.

AP

4

.D82

new 1011 AP
 88134 4
 1082

CONTENTS OF No. XCIII.

ART.	PAGE.
I.—A History of the City of Dublin. By J. T. Gilbert, Member of the Committee of Antiquities of the Royal Irish Academy; Hon. Sec. Irish Archaeological and Celtic Society. Vols. 1. 2. 3. Dublin: McGlashan and Gill, 1859.	1
II.—1. Adam Bede. By George Eliot. London: Blackwood.	
2. Bulletin de l'Hôpital des Enfants Trouvés. ...	33
III.—1. Utopias Desmascaradas do Systema Liberal. Lisbon, 1857.	
2. Portugal and Galicia. By the Earl of Carnarvon. Third edition. London: Murray, 1848.	
3. Recollections of an Excursion to the Monasteries of Alcobaca and Batalha. By the author of Vathek. London: Bentley, 1835.	
4. Portugal Illustrated. By the Rev. W. M. Kinsey, B.D., Fellow of Trinity College and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord Auckland. London: Treuttel, Wurts, and Richter, Soho Square, 1828. ...	43
IV.—A Journal kept in Turkey and Greece in the autumn of 1857 and the beginning of 1858. By Nassau R. Senior, Esq. London: Longman and Co., 1859.	77
V.—The Life and Contemporaneous Church History of Antonio De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, afterwards Dean of Windsor, Master of the Savoy, and Rector of West Ilsley, in the Church of England. By Henry Newland, D.D., Dean of Ferns, 8vo. Oxford and London: Parker, 1859.	97

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
VI.—Vicissitudes of Families, and other Essays. By Sir Bernard Burke, Ulster King of Arms. London : Longman and Co., 1859.	111
VII.—History of Frederick II. of Prussia, called Frederick the Great. By Thomas Carlyle. In four volumes. Vols. i.—ii. London : Chapman and Hall, 1858.	132
VIII.—1. The Times, July 2, 1859.	
2. The Weekly Register, July 9, 1859.	
3. The Dublin Review, for 1854.	
4. Naples : par Jules Gondon. London : Dolman, 1854.	
5. The Memoirs of Cardinal Pacca. Translated by Sir F. Head. London.	
6. Gosselin's Temporal Power of the Popes. Translated. London : Dolman.	
7. Roscoe's Life of Leo X. Bohn's Edition. London, 1854.	
8. Ranke's Lives of the Popes. Bohn's Edition. London, 1853.	168
Notices of Books, ...	264

CONTENTS OF No. XCIV.

ART.	PAGE
I.—1. Exploration Scientifique de l'Algérie pendant les années, 1840, 1841, 1842. Paris : Imprimerie Nationale—chez M. Gide et J. Baudry, Paris.	
2. Inscriptions Romaines de l'Algérie. Par M. Leon Renier. Paris, 1855.	
3. Annuaire de la Société Archéologique de la Province de Constantine. Année 1854, 1855. Paris: A. Leleux.	
4. The Tricolor on the Atlas, or Algeria and the French Conquest. From the German of Dr. Wagner, and other sources. By Francis Pulszky, Esq. T. Nelson and Sons, London, Edinburgh, and New York, 1854.	
5. Algeria, or the Topography and History, Political, Social, and Natural, of French Africa. By John Reynell Morrell. London : N. Cooke, 1854.	
6. Indicateur Général de l'Algérie. Par Victor Berard Alger. Bastide : Libraire Editeur. 1858.	
7. Algiers in 1857. By the Rev. E. W. L. Davies. Longman and Co. 1858.	
8. La Kabylie (and other works), par M. le Général Daumas. Paris : Hachette and Cie.	
9. Sketches of Algeria during the Kabyle War. By H. M. Walmsley, &c., &c. London: Chapman and Hall. 1858.	
10. Four Months in Algeria. By the Rev. J. W. Blakesley, &c., &c. Cambridge : Macmillan and Co. 1859.	273
II.—1. Reisen im Norden. Von Matthias Alexander Castren. 1855. [Travels in the North. By M. A. Castren.]	

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
2. Reise nach dem Nordosten des europäischen Russlands, durch die Tundra der Samojeden. Von Alexander Gustav Schrenck. 1854. [Travels to the North-Eastern parts of European Russia, through the Samojede Tundra. By A. G. Schrenck.] 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 730-568. Dorpat. 1848, 1854.	330
III.—1. The Catholic Case Stated. By a Catholic Layman. Dublin : John Mullany, 1 Parliament Street.	
2. Six Letters to a Cabinet Minister on the Education Crisis in Ireland. By James W. Kavanagh, Esq. Published by the Catholic Bookselling and Publishing Company, 61, New Bond Street, London.	
3. The Board of Education, and its present assailant, and late Panegyrist, the Author of the "Catholic Case Stated." Alexander Thom and Sons, Dublin, 87 and 8, Abbey Street.	
4. A Reply to a book called "The Catholic Case Stated," with a postscript. Dublin : McGlashan and Gill, 50, Upper Sackville Street.	
5. A Letter to the Right Honourable Alexander Macdonnell. By the Rev. E. A. Stopford, Archdeacon of Meath.	
6. Mixed Education. "The Catholic Case" and its Catholic advocate vindicated. Dublin : John Mullany, 1, Parliament Street.	
7. Pastoral Address of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops, to the Catholic Clergy and People of Ireland. Dublin : James Duffy, 7, Wellington Quay.	
8. Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners of National Education. Dublin : Alex. Thom and Sons, 87, Abbey Street.	
9. A Digest of the Evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to enquire into the working of the National System of Education in Ireland. By the Rev. W. le Poer Trench, D. D. Dublin : W. Curry, 9, Upper Sackville Street.	

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
10. Education the Work of the People. A Letter to Lord John Russell. By W. J. Unwin, M. A., Principal of Homerton College. London: Ward and Co., 27, Paternoster Row.	
11. The Advantages of the Secular System. By a Clergyman of the diocese of Meath. Dublin: McGlashan and Gill.	
12. State Rationalism in Education. By the Rev. Henry Formby. Dublin: J. Duffy, Wellington Quay.	
13. Lectures on National Education.—Has the Church or the State the Power to Educate the Nation? By the Rev. F. D. Maurice. London: Rivington, and Darton and Clark, Holborn Hill.	345
IV.—Ceylon: an Account of the Island—Physical, Historical, and Topographical; with Notices of its Natural History, Antiquities, and Productions. By Sir James Emerson Tennent, K.C.S., LL.D., &c. London: Longmans, 1859	... 445
V.—1. The Unity of Worlds and of Nature. Three Essays by the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. Second Edition. London: Longman. 1856.	
2. Christianity without Judaism. By the Rev. Baden Powell, &c. London: Longman. 1857.	
3. The Order of Nature considered in reference to the Claims of Revelation. By the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A., F. R. S., F. R. A. S., F. G. S., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. London: Longman. 1859.	... 468
VI.—1. Egypt's Place in Universal History; an Historical investigation in four books. By C. C. J. Baron Bunsen. Translated from the German by Charles H. Cottrell, Esq. 8vo., vols. I. II. London: Longman and Co., 1848-59.	
2. Ägyptiens Stelle in der Welt-geschichte. Geschichtliche Untersuchung in fünf Büchern. Von. C. C. J. Bunsen, 8vo., vols. I.—V. Hamburg. 1844-57.	

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
3. The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records stated anew, with special Reference to the Doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times ; in Eight Lectures, delivered in the Oxford University Pulpit, at the Bampton Lecture for 1859. By George Rawlinson, M. A. 8vo. London : John Murray, 1859.	
4. The History of Herodotus. A new English Version, with copious Notes, and Appendices, illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus. from the most recent Sources of Information. By George Rawlinson, M. A. 8vo. Four vols., with Maps, and Illustrations. Vols. I.—III. London : John Murray, 1858-9.	
5. The Encyclopædia Britannica. Eighth Edition. Article, Egypt. Edinburgh : Adam and Charles Black, 1855.	
6. Philosophical Transactions, 1855, 1858.—Account of some recent Researches near Cairo, undertaken with the View of throwing Light upon the Geological History of the Alluvial Land of Egypt. London : 1855, 1858.	
7. Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion. By His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman. Second Edition. London : Dolman, 1842	501
Notices of Books	538

AP
4
D 8

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

SEPTEMBER, 1859.

ART. I.—*A History of the City of Dublin.* By J. T. Gilbert, Member of the Committee of Antiquities of the Royal Irish Academy; Hon. Sec. Irish Archæological and Celtic Society. Vols. 1, 2, 3. Dublin: McGlashan and Gill, 1859.

WE have occasionally met with men, who, when questioned as to the land of their birth, refused to acknowledge any particular country, but boasted of their independent existence as cosmopolites or children of the world. We have always considered this as a very unestimable and unenviable idiosyncrasy, and, indeed, looked on such declarations as an affectation of indifference which even the worst of men but rarely feel.

Patriotism, indeed, in its exalted sense, is now little more than known by name and through the medium of history; but there is a material and grosser affection for the land of one's birth, which is almost a common feeling, and which causes a pang in even the most callous heart, when forced to wander an exile on the cold shores of the stranger. When stern necessity, the chill grasp of penury at home, and the hope of better progress abroad, force a man to quit his native land, closing the long vista of the future prospect he sees the shadow of his native hills, and the crowning of all his hopes is his return to the old country.

"I still had hopes, my long vexations past,
Here to return and dwell at home at last."

The exile wandering in the arid plains of Africa, hails with delight a return to European skies. In Europe, he longs for that particular island or country which is his own, and having reached it, he has still a further pilgrimage which terminates in the city or village of his birth and early life. If indeed adverse fortune forbids his return, if forced to breathe his last far from the scene so dear to him, he strives, if wealthy, by some bequest for the public purposes of his native town, to manifest his feelings of regard, and to show that he has not ceased to remember and to love it.

That this is a pleasing and a useful affection, no one can doubt, and though it might be difficult on an attempt to analyze its character, to trace it to any higher or purer source, than some indefinite charm of early association, it is unquestionably implanted by Providence for noble and holy ends.

We do not intend these remarks as any apology for the expression of our deep interest in the work before us.

As citizens of Dublin, we feel, what we think is a justifiable pride in our native city, setting aside entirely our love of it as the city of our birth, and in which the best years of our life have been spent. Its trade no doubt has declined, its streets have lost that bustle which once indicated its commercial prosperity, its river is empty, its docks are silent, its custom-house deserted; but its noble public buildings, its wide and regular streets, its picturesque situation, and, above all, its stirring and interesting recollections, still render it an object of admiration to the traveller and of interest to the historian and archæologist.

To collect and preserve those recollections, to connect and illustrate the history of our metropolis, is the aim of Mr. Gilbert's book, and there can be but one opinion as to the zeal, the faithfulness and ability with which he has performed the task. Had he even been less successful, the very attempt would have been praiseworthy; and had he but stimulated another to the work, instead of perfecting it himself, he would have earned our commendation, as he now deserves our gratitude.

Mr. Gilbert's preface is suggestive of an unhappy characteristic of Irishmen. Enthusiastic, nay, often obtrusive in the praise of their chief city, and indeed feeling a real pride and interest in it, they seemed willing to allow its local history to sink into total oblivion without one

effort to rescue it from such a fate. Speaking of Whitelaw and Walsh's so-called history of Dublin, the only work on the subject hitherto extant, Mr. Gilbert says:—

“ Those volumes, although put forward as the result of original and lengthened research, will, on analysis, be found to consist of inaccurate reprints and various previous publications, including the entire of Harris' History and a very large portion of Archdall's 'Monasticon;' while nearly all the notices of the public buildings of the city were copied almost literally from the superficial accounts published in collections of 'Views in Dublin,' issued towards the close of the last century. Hence, the work does not possess even the merit of giving an accurate account of the city at the period of its publication; and, consequently, readers unacquainted with the manner in which it was compiled have fallen into the error of receiving as descriptive of the town in 1818, passages which originally formed portions of the publication of Harris in 1766, whence they were abstracted, without acknowledgment, by Whitelaw, Warburton, and Walsh, who likewise copied from various un-authentic compilations their meagre biographical notices of eminent natives of Dublin, without making any effort to test their accuracy or correct their errors.

“ A very large number of the churches and other important public edifices of the city has been totally unnoticed in the bulky publication of Whitelaw, Warburton, and Walsh; while the avowed sources of the information of its last editor being solely oral authority, the majority of the work is consequently replete with inaccuracies, and statements unverified by documentary evidence. The only one of the three editors who appears to have been even slightly conversant with documents bearing upon the subject, was Mr. Warburton, who contributed brief extracts from various records to which he had access, but which, as printed by him, are replete with errors and ludicrous typographical inaccuracies.

“ During the first half of the present century the sole reputable publication illustrative of any portion of the history of the city of Dublin was Mr. Mason's elaborate work on the Cathedral of St. Patrick, the research and erudition displayed in which, form a striking contrast to the inaccurate compilation of Whitelaw, Warburton, and Walsh.

“ Although within the last fifteen years various important archæological works have issued from the Irish press, no prospect appeared of any contribution being made to the history of Dublin worthy of comparison with Mr. Cunningham's valuable 'Hand-book of London,' or the publications of a cognate character upon other European cities.”—Vol. i. pp. xi. xii.

Prefixed to the first volume of our author's work is Speed's map of Dublin, a glance at which will give an

excellent idea of the progress of Dublin in extent since 1610. There was then but one bridge crossing the Liffey, at Bridge-street, to which it gave the name.

The space now occupied by Lower Ormond Quay, and Bachelor's Walk, as also by Sackville-street, Lower Abbey-street, and Eden Quay, was then waste ground, intersected by inlets from the sea, or the mouth of the river, at the south side of which nearly the entire of the city was situate, surrounded by a wall with gates at different parts, the names of some of which, as New Gate and James' Gate, are still preserved. The latter terminated the street of the same name, and led out into the open country.

Mr. Gilbert commences his work with an account of Castle-street, the "*Vicus Castri*" of the Anglo-Irish legal records, and which he states was nearly coeval with the stronghold from which it derived its name.

Incidentally, and referring to Austin's Lane, we have an interesting account of the family, life, and literary labours of Sir James Ware, on a portion of the site of whose house Hoey's Court was erected in the 17th century.

It would surprise many persons who are familiar with the appearance of the latter street at the present day, to be told that in 1667, (in which year Dean Swift was born at the house of his uncle Godwin Swift at No. 9,) it was inhabited by many of the principal lawyers practising in Ireland. So recently as the year 1800 the street, then on its gradual descent to its present condition, was inhabited by many respectable attorneys. The device adopted by the government for raising money to pay the army which had been engaged in resisting the rising of the Irish in 1641, gives us an idea of the liberty then enjoyed by the people. Mr. Gilbert tells us that in January 1642 a proclamation was issued, ordering all the inhabitants of the city, without distinction, to deliver up to Messrs. Bladen and Pue, at the house of the former, in Castle-street, all the silver plate, taking therefor the receipt of the aforesaid Bladen and Pue for the same, to be subsequently paid for at the rate of five shillings an ounce when the treasure should arrive from England. A hasty coinage of the silver thus obtained was made, to meet the pressing exigency.

The notice of Castle-street contains a large amount of highly interesting matter, amongst which will be found an

account of the family of Latouche, and of the rise and progress of their bank. It sounds strangely in modern ears to hear of the government borrowing £20,000 from the Latouches to uphold its shattered credit, and prevent the dissolution of the state; and of a subsequent unsuccessful attempt to increase the amount of the loan.

Turning to the left out of Castle-street, we enter Werburgh-street, which derives its name from the ancient church of St. Werburgh, patron of Chester, and of which Mr. Gilbert furnishes us with a complete history accompanied by a curious and highly interesting catalogue of eminent persons connected with it from time to time, including the Reverend Edward Wetenhall, author of the still esteemed Greek and Latin grammars, and Thomas Carter, organist of the Church, and composer of the exquisite air, "Nannie, wilt thou gang wi' me?"

In 1798 the body of Lord Edward Fitz-Gerald was interred in the vaults, and forty-three years later that of Major Sirr in the churchyard of St. Werburgh; thus sleep almost side by side, those two men whose paths in life ran so far asunder, save when they crossed in fierce conflict.

In Werburgh-street, it would appear, stood the first theatre established in Dublin, at least the first of which any record exists. It was opened by John Ogilby, the friend of Shirley, whose plays of the "Doubtful Heir," "St. Patrick for Ireland," and "The Constant Friend," were written for, and first represented in it.

Crossing Castle-street, and bestowing in passing a glance at the history and antiquities of John's Lane, we enter Fish-shamble-street, a name indicative of the fact of fish having been, in early times, exposed for sale in the street. Here, we are informed, lived, till 1757, James Grattan, the father of *the* Henry Grattan.

And here, for the first time, the pleasure with which we have hitherto accompanied our author is dashed with sadness, when we peruse his circumstantial and accurate account of the theatre in Fish-shamble-street.

Volumes of statistics have not the force of argument that this account possesses, in proving the change wrought by the union in the aspect of the City of Dublin, not alone externally, but deep in its social relations. The brilliant theatre, in front of which carriage after carriage, of peer and commoner, set down its glittering and distinguished occupants, in which a masked ball assembled

hosts of titled and noted men, in which private theatricals were performed by the first personages in the country, now stands in gloomy shadow, silent, neglected, and decaying. Not that merely the tide of fashion has rolled its inconstant waters in another direction, and transferred the scene to another portion of the city—not that time has wrought changes of habits and manners, and that other pursuits and amusements engage attention elsewhere in our metropolis—the waters are dried up, not diverted, and the great centre of England has absorbed into its mighty bosom all that once lent lustre, and life, and brilliancy to the streets and public places of Dublin.

The building we have referred to, and which is still known as Fish-shamble-street theatre, was originally constructed for musical performances, and was built for the Bull's Head Musical Society, of which Mr. Gilbert gives us an account, funds being raised by subscription.

It was opened on the 2nd of October, 1741; six weeks afterwards Handel's *L'Allegro, il Penseroso, and il Moderato*, were performed there under his personal superintendence, and the *Messiah* on the 13th of April, 1742.

"The first masquerade ball held in Ireland took place," says Mr. Gilbert, "on the 19th of April, 1776, in the Music Hall; which on the 27th of January, 1777, was opened as a theatre, having been fitted up in an elegant manner for that purpose by a company of actors under Vandermere, in opposition to the other theatres. Their first performance here was the '*Wonder*;' but the entire dependence of the company having been placed in the success of Sheridan's '*Devuena*,' Ryder, manager of the Theatre Royal, procured the words of that opera through a short-hand writer, and brought it forward, with some slight variations, under the name of the '*Governess*;' and the Fishamble-street company, having failed to obtain legal redress, were obliged to forego their opposition. The following contemporary description of a masquerade at the Music Hall on the eve of St. Patrick's Day, 1778, exhibits the mode in which those entertainments were then conducted :

"About twelve at night the company began to assemble; and at two the rooms were quite full, upwards of seven hundred persons being present. The motley group afforded much entertainment; they displayed a variety of taste, elegance, and splendour, in their dresses, and were supported with a fund of wit, humour, and vivacity. The following were the most conspicuous characters:—The Duke of Leinster appeared as a fruit-woman, who changed her oranges for shamrocks, as Patrick's day advanced—and afterwards

a physician—both of which characters were well supported. Mr. Gardiner, as an old woman, carrying her father in a basket, and her child in her arms. This was considered as one of the best and most laughable Masks in the room. Mr. Gardiner, at supper, was in a black domino. Mr. Sackville Hamilton, a French Governante, well dressed and inimitably supported. Mr. Burgh and Mr. O'Reily, as Hussars. Mr. Yelverton, a Methodist preacher, characteristic, masked with judgment. Counsellor Doyle, a friar, well supported. Lord Ely, a hermit. Lord Glerawly, a side-board of plate. Counsellor Day, a cook maid, very well supported. Lord Jocelyn, a house maid. Counsellor Caldbeck, a sailor. Mr. Handcock, half abbé, half officer—a very laughable character. Mr. Hunter, a French soldier. Mr. Coote, a battle axe guard. Captain Southwell, a rifle-man. Mr. Boswell, as Douglas. Mr. Finlay, senior, a huge fashionable lady. Mr. Finlay, junior, an American Warrior. Mr. Eyres, St. Patrick, with a piper. Sir Richard Johuston, in the character of Pan, allowed to be an excellent mask, though he neither sang nor played the bag-pipes. Mr. Robert Alexander, the Great Mogul. Lord Antrim, a Highlander. Mr. Lyster, a Judge in his robes, a very good mask and very humorous. Mr. Marsden, a most excellent miller. Captain French, first as Diana Trapes, which afforded much entertainment—and afterwards in the character of Tancored, elegantly dressed. Sir Vesey Colclough, a sweep-chimney. Mr. Rowley, Isaac, in the Duenna. Mr. Scriven, a Bussora. Mr. Wilson, in the character of an old poet, repeating and distributing humorous verses. Mr. W. Finey, in the character of a magician. Mr. Byrne of Cabinteely, Pam, or the Knave of Clubs, very picturesque. Mr. Baggs, in the character of Linco. Mr. Mossom, Zanga. Mr. Knox, as a female gipsy. Mr. Geale, as a grand Signior. Mr. Penrose, as Tycho. Mr. Bellingham, a sailor. Mr. James Cavendish, as Mercury. Mr. M'Clean, a Dutchman. Sir Michael Cromie, a sailor. Surgeon Doyle, a good piper. Captain Barber, a butterfly-catcher. Mr. Broughill, a malefactor going to an Auto da Fe. Mr. Archdall personated the man with the charity-box on Essex-bridge, and collected £5 9s. 10d. for the confined debtors. An excellent Harlequin who was metamorphosed to a Shylock. Mr. Pollock as Diego, the curious stranger of Strasbourg, from the promontory of noses, as mentioned in Tristram Shandy's tale of Slawkenbergius. The gravity, courtesy, and humour which Sterne so happily contrasted in his description of Diego, was well supported by this mask, and on his nose, which was a nose indeed, there appeared the following inscription, 'This nose has been the making of me.' His dress was a Spanish habit, and crimson satin breeches with silver fringe. Among the female characters which deserve to be mentioned, were—Mrs. Gardiner, in the character of Sestina the Opera singer, a most inimitable mask; she sung one of Sestina's songs. Lady Ely, as a wash-woman. Mrs. F. Flood, a child and doll. Mrs. Crofton, a

young miss, well dressed and characteristical. Miss Gardiner as a Florentine peasant. Miss Graham, a female savage, and afterwards a dancer. The two Miss Normans, witches. Miss Evans and Miss Saunders, two Dianas. Miss Beston as a nun. Mrs. Trench as a house-maid. Miss Blakeney and Miss Whaley as Night. Miss O'Connor, Night. Miss Stewart, an Indian Princess, with a great quantity of jewels. From seven o'clock in the evening till twelve at night, the following houses were open to receive masks: Lord Roden's, Mr. Rowley's, Mr. Aylmer's, Mr. Kilpatrick's, Mr. La Toucho's, Lady Arabella Deunty's, and Counsellor Davis'. At these several houses the masks were entertained with wine and cakes, and among the rest there was an inimitable old beggarman, who excited charity in the breasts of the compassionate; he was dressed in a rug cadow, and liberally supplied with viands from the fair hands of Nuns, Dianas, and Vestals. He was accompanied by Jobson with a Nell, two characters supported with remarkable vivacity, and well dressed. The decorations of the rooms were admirable, and formed a suite, the effect of which, as to convenience, singularity, and ingenuity, was exceedingly pleasing. The company did not begin to retire until five, and it was half an hour after eight before the rooms were entirely cleared.'—Vol. i. pp. 83-85.

In 1793 the Music Hall became converted into a private theatre, under the management of Lord Westmeath and Frederick E. Jones, and the following account of the circumstances attendant on this transformation is quoted by Mr. Gilbert from Mr. Herbert.

“‘Jones told me of a notion he had conceived of getting up a private theatre on an elegant and extensive plan, that would require premises of great space, and asked me if I could direct him to any building that might suit his purpose. I mentioned Fishamble-street. He observed there would be a good subscription from persons of the first rank, and he should feel obliged if I would accompany him to view it. I accordingly attended him, and on our way I pointed out the great advantage of having a shell so appropriate for his plan that he could decorate it as he wished, but that must not be made known until he got it into his possession; and that I thought it might be had a bargain, from its having been some time on hands with the proprietor. We arrived, and found the owner at home. Saw the house and all its appurtenances. We inquired the lowest terms. It was to be let by lease at £80 per annum. Mr. Jones, in a hasty manner, decried its value, and said £60 was enough, and he would give no more: his offer was as hastily rejected, and he turned on his heel and went away. I spoke to the proprietor civilly, and excused Mr. Jones on the score of incompetency to estimate its true value; and I added, that I would

advise him to agree to the rent of £80, and if I should succeed we would return. I then followed Mr. Jones, pointed out the necessity of securing it, for, should the owner learn who were to be the performers, double that sum would not be taken. I advised him to return, and let me write a few lines of agreement, have it signed, and I should witness, and give earnest: to all of which he consented, and the next day he got possession, then set men to work to make the house perfectly secure to receive an audience. Lord Westmeath induced Valdrè, an Italian artist, to direct the ornamental parts, to paint the ceiling and proscenium, also some capital scenes. I added my mite, and painted two figures, Tragedy and Comedy, for the front; also a chamber of portraits for the School for Scandal. When finished, so splendid, tasteful, and beautiful a theatre, for the size, could not be found, I may say, in the three kingdoms: indeed, I never saw anything comparable with it on the Continent. The subscribers now thronged,—the first men in the land,—and from these were selected the performers, who were for the greater part worthy of the house. The *dramatis personæ* were as follows:—Captain Ashe, Mr. Charles Powell Leslie, Mr. Cromwell Price, Mr. Lyster, Mr. Westenra, Mr. Humphrey Butler, Col. Robert Howard, Mr. Thos. Goold, Mr. M'Clintock, Mr. Allen M'Clean, Mr. J. Crampton, Col. Edward Nugent, Col. Barry, Lord Westmeath, Sir Charles Vernon, Mr. Frederick Falkner, Sir Edward Denny, Mr. Wandesford Butler, and Mr. Hamy Stewart, &c.'—Vol. i. pp. 86-87.

To the account of Christ Church Mr. Gilbert has devoted a considerable space, and has displayed in it extraordinary industry and research. Indeed, he has here collected materials for a complete and authentic history of this ancient cathedral. We regret that we have not space at our disposal for extracts from this part of the work, and we therefore heartily commend our readers to the book itself.

The account in question furnishes a striking illustration of the value in after time of such accurate topographical and local details as are furnished by our author. In comparatively a few years the aspect of a city may, by successive improvements and alterations, become so entirely changed as not to be recognizable by a former resident, and subsequent inhabitants, unaided by a history like that before us, would be wholly at a loss to reconcile the existing state of things with old deeds and other documents and references.

Some few years ago the now open space in front of the cathedral was occupied by houses forming a court-yard, devoted principally to toy and fancy shops. One side of

this court-yard was formed by the buildings constituting the four courts, a passage through which, from Christ Church Lane into the court alluded to, and thereout into Fish-shamble-street at the opposite side, was called, "Hell," of which Mr. Gilbert quotes the following account.

" 'This was certainly a very profane and unseemly soubriquet to give to a place that adjoined a Cathedral whose name was Christ Church; and my young mind, when I first entered there, was struck with its unseemliness. Yes; and more especially, when over the arched entrance, there was pointed out to me the very image of the Devil, carved in oak, and not unlike one of those hideous black figures that are still in Thomas street, hung over tobacconists' doors. The locale of *Hell*, and this representation of his Satanic majesty, were famous in those days even beyond the walls of Dublin. I remember well, on returning to my native town after my first visit to Dublin, being asked by all my play-fellows had I been in *Hell*, and had I seen the Devil. Its fame even reached Scotland, and Burns the poet, in his story of 'Death and Dr. Hornbook,' alludes to it when he says—

" 'But this that I am gaun to tell,
Which lately on a night befell,
Is just as true as the Deil's in Hell,
Or Dublin city.'

As *Hell* has not now any local habitation in our city, neither has the Devil—but I can assure you, reader, that there are relics preserved of this very statue to this day; some of it was made into much esteemed snuff-boxes—and I am told there is one antiquarian in our city who possesses the head and horns, and who prizes the relic as the most valuable in his museum. At any rate, *Hell* to me, in those days, was a most attractive place, and often did I go hither, for the yard was full of shops where toys, and fireworks, and kites, and all the playthings that engage the youthful fancy, were exposed for sale. But *Hell* was not only attractive to little boys, but also to bearded men: for here were comfortable lodgings for single men, and I remember reading in a journal of the day an advertisement, intimating that there were 'To be let, furnished apartments in *Hell*. N.B. They are well suited to a lawyer.' Here also were sundry taverns and suuggeries, where the counsellor would cosher with the attorney—where the prebendary and the canon of the cathedral could meet and make merry—here the old stagers, the seniors of the Curraus, the Yelvertons, and the Bully Egans, would enjoy the concomitants of good fellowship—there Prime Sergeant Malone, dark Phil Tisdall, and prior still to them, the noted Sir Toby Butler, cracked their jokes and their marrow-

bones, toasted away claret, and tossed repartee, until they died, as other men die and are forgotten.'"—Vol. i. pp. 144-5.

A complete history of the Tholsel will be found in the account of Skinner's Row, now known as Christ Church Place. There are yet some inhabitants of Dublin living who remember the external appearance of this building, the site of which is now occupied by Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Christ Church Place. In his notice of Skinner's Row, Mr. Gilbert corrects the error which has hitherto assigned to "Pues Occurrences" the position of the first newspaper printed and published in Dublin. Robert Thornton, he tells us, at the sign of the Leather Bottle, issued, in 1685, the first newspaper which appeared in Dublin, called the "Dublin Newsletter."

In this part of the book, as indeed in every other, matters of interest and curiosity meet us at every page, and the whole space at our disposal would be occupied were we to extract as freely as we would wish. We can again but refer the reader to the work itself.

High-street, as its name suggests, was formerly a very important street. In it, at its junction with Skinner's Row, was fixed the high cross of the city, on the steps of which public penances were performed, and from which proclamations were made. The following quaint and amusing account of a riot, which took place in High-street in 1531, quoted by Mr. Gilbert from Stanihurst, gives an idea of the state of police and government in Dublin at that date.

"In the second year of Skeffington his government, it happened that one Henrie White, servant to Benet a merchant of Dublin, was pitching of a cart of haie in the High-street; and having offered boies plaie to passengers that walked to and fro, he let a bottle (truss) of his haie fall on a souldiors bonet, as he passed by his cart. The souldior taking this knavish knacke in dudgeon, hurled his dagger at him, and having narrowlie mist the princocks, he sticked it in a post not far off. White leapt down from the cart, and thrust the souldior through the shoulder with his pike. Whereupon there was a great upreare in the citie between the souldiors and the apprentices, in as much as Thomas Barbie being the Maior, having the King his sword drawne, was hardlie able to appease the fraie, in which diverse were wounded, and none slaine. The Lord Deputie issued out of the Castell, and came as far as the pillorie, to whom the Maior posted through the prease with the sword naked under his arme, and presented White that was the brewer of all this gar-

boile to his Lordship, whome the Governour pardoned, as well for his courage in bickering as for his retchlesse simplicitie and pleasantnesse in telling the whole discourse. Wherebey a man may see how manie bloudie quarels a bralling swashbuckler maie pick out of a bottle of haie, namelie when his braines are forebitten with a bottle of nappie ale.'—Vol. i. pp. 216-17.

Civic hospitality appears to have been never so well appreciated and practised as in Dublin in former years. Patrick Sarsfield, who was Lord Mayor of Dublin in 1554, literally kept open house during his mayoralty. Not even the meanest guest was treated with the slightest show of incivility, but every man was made heartily and truly welcome at all times. He was wont to affirm that in his year of office there were consumed of his wine twenty tuns of claret, over and above white wine, sack, Malmsie, Muscadell, &c., and when remonstrated with by some friends for his boundless liberality, his answer was: "Tush, my masters, take not the matter so hot; whoso cometh to my table and hath no need of my meat, I know he cometh for the good will he beareth me, and therefore I am beholding to thank him for his company; if he resort for need, how may I bestow my goods better than in relieving the poor?"

Nearly two hundred years later High-street boasted of the residence of Humphrey French, who earned the appellation of the "Good Lord Mayor." Swift, who was not given to flatter, or even to praise indiscriminately, in a letter to George Faulkner, quoted by Mr. Gilbert, speaks of French in the warmest terms of panegyric.

Later still was born in High-street, Henry Tresham, painter and poet, eminent in the former branch of art, and by no means contemptible in the latter. His poem of the "Sea-sick Minstrel" is exceedingly spirited and clever.

Passing over, as we are forced to do with merely a mention, Back-lane, Cook-street, and Bridge-street, the account of each of which abounds in deeply-interesting matter, that of Back-lane containing the only account extant of the Jesuits' chapel and college, we come at the conclusion of the first volume to Usher's Quay, and the sketch of the history of Moira House, the residence of the Earl of Moira. Let the reader peruse the account given by Mr. Gilbert of this building; let him read of the splendour of its decorations, the beauty of its gardens, the magnificence of its owners; let him bring before him this

noble residence, thronged with all that was noble, high-born, and famous, and let him, having learned that it is now an asylum for paupers, estimate still further the benefits conferred on Dublin by the legislative union. Setting aside, on this point entirely, political feeling, which we wholly disclaim, we cannot shut our eyes upon the fact so forcibly established by the work under notice, that from the passing of the act of union, a withering blight fell upon the trade, the commerce, and the society of Dublin; that thenceforth its gaiety became gloom, its bustle silence, its grandeur wretchedness, its wealth poverty. Splendid mansions, till then the residences of their noble owners, the maintenance of whose extensive establishments acted as a direct stimulus to trade, and as the means of circulating much money, and affording considerable employment, became converted into public institutions, sometimes into warehouses. The brilliant equipages disappeared from the streets, art and literature followed their patrons, and sought elsewhere that countenance and support which began to be withdrawn at home.

In the second volume we are introduced to Parliament-street, and a complete and interesting memoir of George Faulkner, the friend and publisher of Dean Swift. We extract a sketch of Faulkner and his dinners, given by Cumberland the dramatist, and quoted by Mr. Gilbert.

“‘I found myself in a company so miscellaneously and whimsically classed, that it looked more like a fortuitous concourse of oddities, jumbled together from all ranks, orders, and descriptions, than the effect of invitation and design. Description must fall short in the attempt to convey any sketch of that eccentric being to those who have not read him in the notes of Jephson, or seen him in the mimicry of Foote, who in his portraits of Faulkner found the only sitter whom his extravagant pencil could not caricature; for he had a solemn intrepidity of egotism, and a daring contempt of absurdity, that fairly outaced imitation, and, like Garrick's ode on Shakspeare, which Johnson said ‘defied criticism,’ so did George in the original spirit of his own perfect buffoonery, defy caricature. He never deigned to join in the laugh he had raised, nor seemed to have a feeling of the ridicule he had provoked: at the same time that he was pre-eminently and by preference the butt and buffoon of the company, he could find openings and opportunities for hits of retaliation, which were such left-handed thrusts as few could parry: nobody could foresee where they would fall, nobody of course was fore-armed, and as there was in his calculation but one super-eminent character in the kingdom of Ireland, and he the printer of

the Dublin Journal, rank was no shield against George's arrows, which flew where he listed, and fixed or missed as chance directed, he cared not about consequences. He gave good meat and excellent claret in abundance; I sat at his table once from dinner till two in the morning, whilst George swallowed immense potations with one solitary sodden strawberry at the bottom of the glass, which he said was recommended to him by his doctor for its cooling properties. He never lost his recollection or equilibrium the whole time, and was in excellent foolery; it was a singular coincidence, that there was a person in company who had received his reprieve at the gallows, and the very judge who had passed the sentence of death upon him. This did not in the least disturb the harmony of the society, or embarrass any human creature present. All went off perfectly smooth, and George, adverting to an original portrait of Dean Swift, which hung in his room, told us abundance of excellent and interesting anecdotes of the Dean and himself with minute precision, and an importance irresistibly ludicrous. There was also a portrait of his late lady, Mrs. Faulkner, which either made the painter or George a liar, for it was frightfully ugly, whilst he swore she was the most divine object in creation. In the meantime he took credit to himself for a few deviations in the point of gallantry, and asserted that he broke his leg in flying from the fury of an enraged husband, whilst Foote constantly maintained that he fell down an area with a tray of meat upon his shoulder, when he was journeyman to a butcher: I believe neither of them spoke the truth. George prosecuted Foote for lampooning him on the stage of Dublin; his counsel, the Prime Sergeant, compared him to Socrates, and his libeller to Aristophanes; this I believe was all that George got by his course of law; but he was told he had the best of the bargain in the comparison, and sat down contented under the shadow of his laurels.'—Vol. ii. pp. 50-51.

To Smock Alley Theatre Mr. Gilbert justly devotes considerable space. The rise and progress of dramatic art are usually in proportion to the increasing refinement and civilization of a city, and the citizens of Dublin have been justly celebrated for their critical superiority in this branch of art. Their taste is usually correct, their judgment accurate, their applause discriminative, and their condemnation and dislike of everything low or indecent marked and decisive. No complete history of the histrionic art can be written in which the Dublin theatres will not find frequent mention, and no writer of such a history can fail to derive considerable assistance from Mr. Gilbert's volumes. Taking the notice of Crow-street theatre, which occurs in a later part of the second volume,

in connection with that of Smock Alley, we have a complete and most accurate account of the drama in Dublin from its earliest infancy to the destruction of its once most cherished home, Crow-street theatre. At these theatres, from time to time, the most eminent performers, male and female, appeared, including amongst the former, Barry, Mossop, Thomas Sheridan, Garrick, Macklin, Edmund Kean, Cooke, and Kemble, and amongst the latter, Mrs. Woffington, Mrs. Abington, Mrs. Jordan, Miss Catley, Miss Pope, Miss Walstein, Miss O'Neill, and Mrs. Siddons.

There is no part of the work before us which displays more research and industry than that which contains the account of Crow-street Theatre. In this nothing of interest is omitted or overlooked, new sources of information and illustration are opened up; notices of individuals which are in fact condensed and complete biographies, are joined with local descriptions, the accuracy of which supplies the place of maps or plans, and the whole is blended into one easy narrative, which pleases while it instructs and informs.

In the history of Dame-street we find an account of the origin and progress of the Royal Dublin Society, which, like many other successful projects, had but a small beginning, for, though actually formed in 1731, it was not till 1756 that the members provided themselves with a house of their own, in which to hold their meetings, and transact their business.

We regret being unable to extract the romantic and interesting story, told by Mr. Gilbert, in his notice of Anglesey-street, and which will be found at page 322 of the second volume. It fully verifies the trite adage that 'truth is stranger than fiction,' and indeed the true story furnished the idea and materials for one of the most celebrated fictions of Sir Walter Scott, *Guy Mannering*.

In the beginning of the third volume of our author, we find an accurate and complete account of the origin of the Irish College of Physicians, and the merit due to the first president of that body, Dr. John Stearne, is duly recognised and assigned.

The inauguration of the statue of King William the Third, in College-green, took place on the 1st of July, 1701, and was conducted with considerable pomp and ceremony. The 4th of November, the anniversary of

William's landing in England, was subsequently each year observed with much solemnity, the Lord Lieutenant, Lord Chancellor, Lord Mayor, and the Judges, forming a procession from the castle, and marching through the streets, and eventually thrice round the statue. The public honours thus conferred, were, however, almost counterbalanced by the numerous indignities which from time to time, were offered to the effigy of majesty. These practical insults were of course arranged and perpetrated at night, and on the approach of daylight, the first passing worshipper of the glorious memory, was shocked at seeing the royal face bedaubed with filth, or a straw-stuffed figure seated with insolent familiarity astride behind his majesty. One of the most daring and successful of these attacks was perpetrated in 1805, and is thus narrated by Mr. Gilbert.

"In 1805, the 4th of November falling on Sunday, the usual procession was postponed to the ensuing day. At midnight on Saturday, the 3rd of the month, the watchman on duty on College-green was disturbed at his post by a painter, who stated that he had been sent by the city decorator to prepare the statue for the approaching ceremony, adding that the apprehended violence of the people had rendered it advisable to have this office performed at night. Having gained access to the monument, the artist plied his brush industriously for some time, and, on descending, requested the watchman to take care of the painting utensils left on the statue, while he repaired to his employer's warehouse for some material necessary to complete the decoration. The night, however, passed away without the return of the painter; and at day-break on Sunday, the statue was found completely covered with an unctuous black pigment, composed of tar and grease, most difficult to remove, the vessel which had contained the mixture being suspended from a halter tied round the king's neck. This act caused the most violent excitement amongst the Orange Societies in the city, but, fortunately for himself, the adventurous artist was not discovered; and the affair was chronicled as follows in a street ballad, to the air of the old Dublin gaol song, 'The night before Larry was stretched :—

"The night before Billy's birth-day
 Some friend to the Dutchman came to him,
 And, though he expected no pay,
 He told the policeman he'd do him ;
 'For,' said he, 'I must have him in style :
 The job is not wonderful heavy,
 And I'd rather sit up for a while
 Than see him undress'd at the levée :
 For he was the broth of a boy.'

"Then up to his Highness he goes,
 And with tar he anointed his body,
 So that when the morning arose
 He look'd like a sweep in a noddy;
 It fitted him just to the skin,
 Wherever the journeyman stuck it;
 And, after committing the sin,
 'Have an eye,' said he, 'Watch, to the bucket:
 For I have not done with him yet.'

.

"The birth-day being now very nigh,
 And swaddling clothes made for the hero,
 A painter was sent for to try
 To whitewash the face of the Negro;
 He gave him the brush, to be sure,
 But the first man so deeply did stain him
 That the whitewash effected no cure:
 Faith, the whole River Boyne would not clean him!
 And still he remains in the dirt."

—Vol. iii. pp. 52-3.

'The last iconoclastic effort was directed against the statue in 1836, of which Mr. Gilbert furnishes the following account.

"On the night of Thursday, the 7th of April, 1836, at a few minutes past 12 o'clock, a light appeared suddenly on the northern side of the statue, and immediately afterwards the figure of the King was blown several feet into the air, with a deafening explosion, extinguishing all the lamps in College-green and its vicinity. The figure fell at a considerable distance from the pedestal, in the direction of Church-lane; its legs and arms were broken, and its head completely defaced by the fall; the horse was also much injured and shattered in several places. The mutilated figure was next day placed in a cart and conveyed to College-street police-office, where it was deposited in the hall while an investigation was held relative to the circumstances connected with the outrage. The inquiry, however, elicited no important information, except that, on a careful examination of the riderless horse, a hole was found bored in its back, between the right hip and the saddle skirt; and as there was no appearance of gunpowder having been placed in its body, it was concluded that the agency of fulminating silver had been employed. The occurrence for some time furnished the newspapers and ballad-singers with an interesting theme: the Catholics charged the Orangemen with the offence, while the latter repelled the imputation, and ridiculed a meeting held by the Liberal party on the 25th of April, in the Exchange, for the purpose of 'express-

ing indignation at the outrage on the statue of King William III., and of devising means of bringing the perpetrators to justice.' Rewards of £100 and £200 were offered respectively by the Lord Lieutenant and the Corporation for the detection of the iconoclast, who was not discovered, and the secret was kept until the term of the information expired. The Corporation issued notices that they would receive proposals from contractors to restore the statue, and the damages having been repaired, King William was reinstated in his seat, and exposed to public view on the 1st of the following July.

"During the Mayoralty of Daniel O'Connell, in 1842, the statue was coloured bronze, and in the succeeding year the pedestal was cleared of the numerous coatings of paint with which it had been covered. The railings, with the fountain on the western side, have been removed; and, at the expense of the Corporation of the city, the statue was thoroughly repaired and strengthened in 1855."—Vol. iii. pp. 55-6.

"The first Parliament," to quote again from Mr. Gilbert, "convened in Ireland, after the Restoration was opened at Chichester house, on the 8th of May, 1661."

Chichester house, originally a hospital, was situated in College-green, and on its site were begun to be erected, in 1729, the new houses of Parliament, now the Bank of Ireland. The history of Chichester-house, and of the various Parliaments, from time to time, assembled in it, is, as given by Mr. Gilbert, most interesting and highly important, in a historical point of view. Here, as in many other parts of the work, we are tempted to pause and admire the research and ingenuity which from a confused and almost inaccessible mass of materials, have constructed so clear and regular a narrative, till now not to be found in any printed book.

The new Houses of Parliament were finished in 1739, and excited universal admiration.

Mr. Gilbert's account of the constitution and character of the Parliaments of Ireland from the time of Charles II. will do much to clear away the mists of prejudice and ignorance which still obscure the vision of many persons, and cause them, in speaking and writing, to express themselves with lamentable inaccuracy on this important subject.

During the period of O'Connell's latter agitation a common argument used against that movement was the corrupt state of former Irish Parliaments, and the assertion that a repeal of the Union, and the reassembling of a

Parliament in Dublin, would usher in a fresh scene of political dishonesty.

Mr. Gilbert has satisfactorily shown that the corruption which characterised the Irish Parliaments was solely the work of the English Government, which, by maintaining a wretchedly defective system of representation, was enabled to pack the House with its own nominees.*

In the next place, the far greater part, in fact nearly the entire of the Irish people, the Catholics, were wholly unrepresented, being permitted neither to sit in, nor vote for members of Parliament.

Lord Chancellor Clare, Mr. Gilbert tells us, declared in the House, that the English ministers in Ireland, following the example of Lord Townsend, would spend half a million to obtain a majority in the Irish Parliament, and that they would make every man the victim of his vote.

"This threat," he continues, "led to the signature of a 'round robin,' by which the Opposition Members engaged among themselves not to accept offices or pensions vacated by the dismissal of any of their party. Government, having found that the Opposition could not be seduced, summarily dismissed them and their friends from the offices which they held, and succeeded in securing a majority in Parliament by creating new appointments, augmenting the Pension List, and selling peerages. Referring to the Parliamentary influence thus obtained, George Ponsonby stated, in one of the debates, that there were 110 placemen in the House; that of the gross revenue of the country, one-eighth was divided among Members of Parliament, and that they appeared determined not to let any pass that was not agreeable to the English Minister or the English Merchant.

"The national benefits anticipated from an unfettered Legislature were thus neutralized by the patronage and influence still centred in the British Ministers and their subalterns in Ireland, who by the sale of Peerages, filled the House of Lords with their nominees, and acquired funds to purchase seats in the House of Commons for their dependents, defeating every effort aimed against the corruption by which their Parliamentary predominance was

* We are acquainted with a citizen of Dublin, whose father, at the time an officer in the army, and stationed in Scotland, was more than once offered a seat in the Irish House of Commons, on the simple condition that he would vote as he might be instructed by the Government.

maintained. The English Cabinet thus sat in the Parliament of Ireland, and was the Parliament, to the exclusion not only of the Catholics, but of the country."—Vol. iii. pp. 135-6.

In approaching that portion of the volume before us, in which is given the description of the manner in which the passing of the Act of Union was effected, we cannot avoid a feeling of strong indignation, not unmixed with sadness, a sadness somewhat alleviated by the generous and patriotic conduct of some of the opponents of the measure.

Again, disclaiming the slightest political sentiment on this subject, we cannot but feel that a measure, supported and passed by the aid of sordid, tyrannical, and oppressive devices, by open bribery and undisguised corruption, could not have emanated from a sincere and pure desire to benefit the country.

"The question," writes Mr. Gilbert, "of a Union with Great Britain was first debated in the Parliament of Ireland in consequence of a reference to the measure in the King's Speech on the opening of the session, on the 22nd of January, 1799. At this juncture the people were distracted by domestic dissensions and panic-stricken at the results of the recent civil war; the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended; and courts martial were sitting in various parts of the kingdom, which was covered by troops exceeding in number 137,000 men. In the debate thirty Members spoke for, and forty-five against, the Union: among the latter was William Conyngham Plunket, who declared that during the past six weeks a system of black corruption had been carried on within the walls of the Castle, which would disgrace the annals of the worst period of the history of either country. He saw two right honourable gentlemen [Sir John Parnell, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Prime Sergeant, James Fitzgerald,] sitting within those walls, who had long and faithfully served the Crown, and who had been dismissed because they dared to express a sentiment in favour of the freedom of their country. He saw another honourable gentleman who had been forced to resign his place as Commissioner of the Revenue, because he refused to co-operate in that dirty job of a dirty administration: did they dare to deny this? 'I say,' he continued, 'that at this moment the threat of dismissal from office is suspended over the heads of the Members who now sit around me, in order to influence their votes on the question of this night, involving everything that can be sacred or dear to man: do you desire to take down my words? Utter the desire, and I will prove the truth of them at your Bar. Sir, I would warn you against the consequences of carrying this

measure by such means as this, but that I see the necessary defeat of it in the honest and universal indignation which the adoption of such means excites. In the most express manner, I,' added Plunket, 'deny the competency of Parliament to do this act (of Union); I warn you, do not lay your hands on the Constitution. I tell you, that if, circumstanced as you are, you pass this Act, it will be a mere nullity, and no man in Ireland will be bound to obey it. You have not been elected for this purpose. You are appointed to make laws, and not legislatures. You are appointed to exercise the functions of legislators, and not to transfer them. Yourselves you may extinguish, but Parliament you cannot extinguish. It is enthroned in the hearts of the people—it is enshrined in the sanctuary of the constitution—it is as immortal as the island which protects it. As well might the frantic suicide hope that the act which destroys his miserable body should extinguish his eternal soul.'

"The sitting of the House," says Mr. Gilbert, "continued without interruption from about 4 P. M. on the 22nd of January, to 1½ P. M. on the following day, when, including Tellers and the Speaker, 217 Members divided, and the Minister obtained a majority of one. The second debate commenced at 4½ P. M. on the 24th of the same month. 'The people,' says Barrington, 'collected in vast multitudes around the House; a strong sensation was everywhere perceptible; immense numbers of ladies of distinction crowded, at an early hour, into the galleries, and by their presence and their gestures animated the patriotic spirit, upon the prompt energy of which alone depended the fate of Ireland.—After the most stormy debate remembered in the Irish Parliament, the question was loudly called for by the Opposition, who were now tolerably secure of a majority: never did so much solicitude appear in any public assembly;—at length above sixty Members had spoken, the subject was exhausted, and all parties seemed impatient. The House divided, and the Opposition withdrew to the Court of Requests. It is not easy to conceive, still less to describe, the anxiety of that moment: a considerable delay took place. Mr. Ponsonby and Sir Laurence Parsons were at length named Tellers for the amendment; Mr. Smith and Lord Tyrone for the address. 111 Members had declared against the Union, and when the doors were opened, 105 was found to be the total number of the Ministers' adherents. Mr. Egan, Chairman of Dublin County, a coarse, large, bluff, red-faced Irishman, was the last [of the Opposition] who entered. His exultation knew no bounds; as No. 110 was announced, he stopped a moment at the Bar, flourished a great stick which he had in his hand over his head, and, with the voice of a Stentor, cried out, 'And I'm a hundred-and-eleven!' He then sat quietly down, and burst out into an immoderate and almost convulsive fit of laughter; it was all heart. Never was there a finer picture of genuine patriotism. He

was very far from being rich, and had an offer to be made a Baron of the Exchequer, with £3500 a year, if he would support the Union; but refused it with indignation.

"The gratification of the Anti-Unionists was unbounded; and as they walked deliberately in, one by one, to be counted, the eager spectators, ladies as well as gentlemen, leaning over the galleries, ignorant of the result, were panting with expectation. Lady Castlereagh, then one of the finest women of the Court, appeared in the Sergeant's box, palpitating for her husband's fate. The desponding appearance and fallen crests of the Ministerial benches, and the exulting air of the Opposition Members as they entered, were intelligible. The murmurs of suppressed anxiety would have excited an interest even in the most unconnected stranger, who had known the objects and importance of the contest. How much more, therefore, must every Irish breast which panted in the galleries have experienced that thrilling enthusiasm which accompanies the achievement of patriotic actions, when the Ministers' defeat was announced from the chair! A due sense of respect and decorum restrained the galleries within proper bounds; but a loud cry of satisfaction from the female audience could not be prevented; and no sooner was the event made known out of doors, than the crowds that had waited during the entire night, with increasing impatience, for the vote which was to decide upon the independence of their country, sent forth loud and reiterated shouts of exultation, which, resounding through the corridors and penetrating to the body of the House, added to the triumph of the conquerors, and to the misery of the adherents of the conquered Minister."—"Upon the rising of the House, the populace became tumultuous, and a violent disposition against those who had supported the Union was manifest, not only amongst the common people, but amongst those of a much higher class, who had been mingling with them. On the Speaker's coming out of the House, the horses were taken from his carriage, and he was drawn in triumph through the streets by the people, who conceived the whimsical idea of tackling the Lord Chancellor (Clare) to the coach, and (as a captive general in a Roman triumph,) forcing him to tug at the chariot of his conqueror. The populace closely pursued his Lordship for that extraordinary purpose; he escaped with difficulty, and fled, with a pistol in his hand, to a receding doorway in Clarendon-street. But the people, who pursued him in sport, set up a loud laugh at him, as he stood terrified against the door; they offered him no personal violence, and returned in high glee to their more innocent amusement of drawing the Speaker."—Vol. iii. pp. 147-150.

The defeat thus experienced stimulated the English Government to fresh activity, and the work of bribery and intimidation was renewed with redoubled zeal. Mr. Fitz-Gerald, Prime Sergeant, and Sir John Parnell, Chan-

cellor of the Exchequer, who voted with the majority, were dismissed from office. Hardy was ineffectually tempted by splendid offers, which, though in actual want, he nobly refused, and Charles Kendal Bushe, afterwards Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, with equal determination, spurned the most tempting inducements to sacrifice his principles.

"Frederick Falkiner, Member for Dublin County, was one of the most remarkable instances of inflexible public integrity in Ireland. 'He would have been a valuable acquisition to the Government, but nothing could corrupt him. Week after week he was ineffectually tempted, through his friends, by a Peerage, or aught he might desire; he replied, 'I am poor, 'tis true; but no human power, no reward, no torture, no elevation, shall ever tempt me to betray my country—never mention to me again so infamous a proposal.'

"The Minister experienced considerable difficulties in coming to terms with the needy English and Scotch officials, who, without character or property, had been placed in the House to vote for the Union.

"Such persons were determined to strike a hard bargain, and one of them (Mr. M'Donald) being urged by the Minister to support the measure, very coolly laid his hat across the Bar of the House, and declared that he would not vote for the Union, or take away his hat, till five thousand guineas were secured to him. His terms were complied with, and an undertaking to that effect was given."—Vol. iii. p. 152.

It is painful in the extreme to follow the measure through the different stages of its progress, until it finally became law. Setting aside entirely its merits or demerits, as an Act of Parliament, every candid mind must revolt at the means by which it was passed. There can be now no discussion or argument on the point. Mr. Gilbert has given us so comprehensive, so complete a detail of these means, and supported his account so fully by extracts from other writers, that the most prejudiced must be convinced that the oft imputed corruption of the Irish Parliament was the work of the English Government, applied principally to the needy Scotch and English officials, whom the influence of the same Government had thrust into Irish seats.

The Irish Parliament having been thus annihilated, various propositions for turning the building, in which it had been held, to account, were discussed, and it was

used at one time for an exhibition of pictures, at another as a barrack, but was eventually purchased from the Treasury by the Bank of Ireland, for £40,000, subject to a ground rent of £240 per annum.

Two circumstances in connection with its 'conversion into a bank, are characteristic of a feeling which even yet prevails to some extent in Ireland, and by which many of our Public Boards appear to be guided in their patronage of art and skill.

Henry A. Baker, Master of the Dublin 'Society's Architectural School, and to whom was adjudged the prize of £300 offered by the Bank, for the best plan for adapting the building to their purposes, sent his plans to London, and procured them to be forwarded thence to Dublin, as from an English architect, fearing, and doubtless truly fearing, that if he competed as an Irish artist, his chances of success would be very small indeed.

Edmund Smith, whose merits as a sculptor, have not, and perhaps never will be, duly appreciated, a Dublin artist, was commissioned to execute three figures for the southern front, trammelled by the humiliating and unjust condition that they should be after the designs of Flaxman, the English sculptor. When they were finished, Smith received for each £150, Flaxman having demanded five hundred guineas for each.

The chandelier of the House of Commons, we are informed, now hangs in the Examination Hall of Trinity College, the Speaker's chair of the House of Lords in the possession of the Royal Irish Academy, and that of the Speaker of the House of Commons, stands in the Board room of the Dublin Society. The Speaker's mace is now in the possession of Lord Massarene, grandson of John Foster, the last Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, and who refused the demand of the Government, after the Union, to deliver it up, and was exhibited by that nobleman at the Dublin Exhibition, and subsequently at a smaller exhibition, recently held in the new gallery of the Royal Dublin Society.

And so has departed the glory of the Irish Parliament and its shame. Its glory in the eloquence and patriotism of Grattan and Flood, of Plunkett and of Saurin, its shame in the corruption of its meaner members. Nor was its career unmarked by usefulness, as is well illustrated in the following passage, quoted by Mr. Gilbert.

“‘The Parliament of Ireland, despite its defects, did more for the country,’ it has been justly observed, ‘in the short space of time it was allowed to live, than England had effected in all her long and varied struggles for liberty. Ireland removed the restraints that for centuries before had been imposed on her commerce and her constitution; she repealed Poynings’ law—she insisted on the repeal of the 6th of George I.—she obtained Free Trade—she obtained an independent Constitution—she restored the final judicature to her Lords—she established the independence of her Judges—she secured to the country the benefits of the Habeas Corpus Act—she purified the elective franchise—she repealed the perpetual Mutiny Bill, and placed on record the immortal resolve, that a standing army in time of peace, without the consent of Parliament, was contrary to law—in itself a charter of liberty. All these splendid acquisitions she obtained in 1782, after a short reign of a few days, by means of her Parliament, freed from foreign control and influenced by Irish feelings and Irish counsels. Subsequently, after a severe struggle against a corrupt Court, she obtained a Navigation Act, a Pension Bill, a Place Bill, a Responsibility Bill. She diffused the spirit of religious liberty, and emancipated in a degree the mind of her people. She repealed numerous penal laws, and gave to Roman Catholics property and power; and accompanied the possession of land with the right of the elective franchise. She opened to them the Bar, and the Assistant Barristers’ Bench; and if she had not been thwarted by British influence, she would have given to them full and complete Emancipation, and placed, in every respect, the Roman Catholic on an equality with his Protestant fellow-countryman. England had rights and precedents of her own to follow. She could boast of a proud constitutional ancestry, who traced their names, their descent, their glories, in hereditary succession to the great charters of their country, that they had thirty times confirmed. But no such advantages were possessed by Ireland; she had to create almost everything, and to create it out of chaos.’”—Vol. iii. pp. 176-7.

In Grafton-street, at No. 75, now number 79, a school was opened in 1758 by Samuel Whyte, who afterwards numbered amongst his pupils, several eminent men, including Richard Brinsley Sheridan, and Thomas Moore. Whyte’s conduct with reference to his early patron and friend, Thomas Sheridan, manager of Smock Alley Theatre, displays his character in a most amiable light, and indeed Sheridan appears to have been worthy of the interest and regard displayed on his behalf.

In Grafton-street, at No. 108, adjoining the building until recently occupied by the Irish Academy, was the

shop of Patrick Byrne, an eminent bookseller, who removed thither from College Green in 1784.

Byrne was the publisher of many pamphlets in favour of Parliamentary reform and Catholic emancipation, and was a staunch member of the United Irishmen, for his connection with which body he was eventually obliged to expatriate himself to America, where he died.

The following dialogue between Byrne and Lord Clonmel chief justice of the King's Bench, relative to the publication of the trial of Hamilton Rowan, is given by Mr. Gilbert, and furnishes a curious picture of the times and of the demeanour of the highest legal functionary of the day.

“*Lord Clonmel.*—Your servant, Mr. Byrne : I perceive you have advertised Mr. Rowan's trial.

“*Byrne.*—The advertisement, my Lord, is Mr. Rowan's, he has selected me as his publisher, which I think an honour, and I hope it will be profitable.

“*Lord Clonmel.*—Take care, Sir, what you do; I give you this caution; for if there are any reflections on the Judges of the land, by the eternal G— I will lay you by the heels!

“*Byrne.*—I have many thanks to return your Lordship for your caution; I have many opportunities of going to Newgate, but I have never been ambitious of that honour, and I hope in this case to stand in the same way. Your Lordship knows I have but one principle in trade, which is to make money of it, and that if there were two publications giving different features to the trial, I would publish both. There is a trial published by M'Kenzie.

“*Lord Clonmel.*—I did not know that; but say what you may on the subject, if you print or publish what may inflame the mob, it behoves the Judges of the land to notice it; and I tell you, by the eternal G—, if you publish or misstate my expressions, I will lay you by the heels! One of Mr. Rowan's advocates set out with an inflammatory speech, misstating what I said and stating what I did not say. I immediately denied it, and appealed to the Court and gentlemen in it, and they all contradicted him, as well as myself. These speeches were made for the mob, to mislead and inflame them, which I feel it my duty to curb. If the publication is intended to abuse me, I don't value it; I have been so long in the habit of receiving abuse, that it will avail little; but I caution you how you publish it; for if I find anything reflecting on or misstating me, I will take care of you.

“*Byrne.*—I should hope Mr. Rowan has too much honour to have anything misstated or inserted in his trial that would involve his publisher.

“*Lord Clonmel.*—What! is Mr. Rowan preparing his own trial?

“*Byrne.*—He is, my Lord.

“*Lord Clonmel.*—Oho, oho! that is a different thing. That gentleman would not have been better used by me, standing in the situation he did, if he was one of the Princes of the blood.

“*Byrne.*—My Lord, Mr. Rowan being his own printer, you know he will publish his own trial; I stand only as his publisher.

“*Lord Clonmel.*—Even as his publisher, I will take care of you; and I have no objection to this being known.

“*Byrne.*—I return your Lordship many thanks.”—Vol. iii. pp. 213-14.

The very complete account of the Royal Irish Academy furnished by Mr. Gilbert will be read with interest and pleasure. The spirit which enabled its members to struggle through the many difficulties, financial and social, which beset their progress, must have had its birth in a pure love of science and art, and in a sincere wish to foster and promote a knowledge of the antiquities and archæology of the country. In 1816 they were forced to petition parliament for an increased grant, and we extract the following significant passage from the petition then presented. “Since the union of the two countries, the altered circumstances of the city of Dublin, as being no longer the winter residence of the Irish nobility and gentry, have more and more contributed to diminish the number of candidates for admission, and, of course, proportionably to lessen the funds of the Academy; until, at length, the present (1816) Members feel themselves reduced to the alternative either of relinquishing their pursuits, or of soliciting from the bounty of Parliament such increased assistance as is essential to their continuing an active body corporate.”

Largely as we have extracted from Mr. Gilbert's volumes, we cannot resist the temptation of placing before our readers the following amusing story which will be found at p. 252 in the account of Molesworth street. Richard Parsons was in 1718 created first Earl of Rosse, and appears to have been a man of considerable humour and animal spirits, which he does not seem to have made any effort to control and which betrayed him occasionally into practical jokes, in their results at least, of somewhat serious character.

“‘The late Earl of Rosse,’ says a writer of the middle of the last century, ‘was, in character and disposition, like the humorous Earl of Rochester; he had an infinite fund of wit, great spirits, and a liberal heart; was fond of all the vices which the beau monde call pleasures, and by those means first impaired his fortune as much as he possibly could do; and finally his health, beyond repair. To recite any part of his wit here is impossible, though I have heard much of it, but as it either tended to blasphemy, or, at the best, obscenity, it is better where it is. A nobleman could not, in so censorious a place as Dublin, lead a life of rackets, brawls, and midnight confusion, without being a general topic for reproach, and having fifty thousand faults invented to complete the number of those he had: nay, some asserted that he dealt with the Devil; established a Hell-fire Club at the Eagle Tavern on Cork-hill; and that one Worsdale, a mighty innocent, facetious painter, who was indeed only the agent of his gallantry, was a party concerned. Be it as it will, his Lordship’s character was torn to pieces everywhere, except at the Groom Porter’s, where he was a man of honour; and at the taverns, where none surpassed him in generosity. Having led this life till it brought him to death’s door, his neighbour, the Rev. John Madden, (Vicar of St. Anne’s and Dean of Kilmore,) a man of exemplary piety and virtue, having heard his Lordship was given over, thought it his duty to write him a very pathetic letter, to remind him of his past life, the particulars of which he mentioned, such as profligacy, gaming, drinking, rioting, turning day into night, blaspheming his Maker, and, in short, all manner of wickedness; and exhorting him in the tenderest manner to employ the few moments that remained to him, in penitently confessing his manifold transgressions, and soliciting his pardon from an offended Deity, before whom he was shortly to appear. It is necessary to acquaint the reader that the late Earl of Kildare was one of the most pious noblemen of the age, and in every respect a contrast in character to Lord Rosse. When the latter, who retained his senses to the last moment, and died rather for want of breath than want of spirits, read over the Dean’s letter (which came to him under cover), he ordered it to be put in another paper, sealed up, and directed to the Earl of Kildare: he likewise prevailed on the Dean’s servant to carry it, and to say it came from his master, which he was encouraged to do by a couple of guineas, and his knowing nothing of its contents. Lord Kildare was an effeminate, puny little man, extremely formal and delicate, insomuch that when he was married to Lady Mary O’Brien, one of the most shining beauties then in the world, he would not take his wedding gloves off to embrace her. From this single instance may be judged with what surprise and indignation he read over the Dean’s letter, containing so many accusations for crimes he knew himself entirely innocent of. He first ran to his lady, and informed her that Dean Madden was actually mad; to prove

which, he delivered her the epistle he had just received. Her Ladyship was as much confounded and amazed at it as he could possibly be, but withal observed the letter was not written in the style of a madman, and advised him to go to the Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. John Hoadly) about it. Accordingly, his Lordship ordered his coach, and went to the episcopal palace, where he found his Grace at home, and immediately accosted him in this manner: 'Pray, my Lord, did you ever hear that I was a blasphemer, a profligate, a gamester, a rioter, and everything that's base and infamous?' 'You, my Lord,' said the Bishop, 'every one knows that you are the pattern of humility, godliness, and virtue.' 'Well, my Lord, what satisfaction can I have of a learned and reverend divine, who, under his own hand, lays all this to my charge?' 'Surely,' answered his Grace, 'no man in his senses, that knew your Lordship, would presume to do it; and if any clergyman has been guilty of such an offence, your Lordship will have satisfaction from the spiritual court.' Upon this Lord Kildare delivered to his Grace the letter, which he told him was that morning delivered by the Dean's servant, and which both the Archbishop and the Earl knew to be Dean Madden's handwriting. The Archbishop immediately sent for the Dean, who, happening to be at home, instantly obeyed the summons. Before he entered the room, his Grace advised Lord Kildare to walk into another apartment, while he discoursed the gentleman about it, which his Lordship accordingly did. When the Dean entered, his Grace looking very sternly, demanded 'if he had wrote that letter?' The Dean answered, 'I did, my Lord.' 'Mr. Dean, I always thought you a man of sense and prudence, but this unguarded action must lessen you in the esteem of all good men; to throw out so many causeless invectives against the most unblemished nobleman in Europe, and accuse him of crimes to which he and his family have ever been strangers, must certainly be the effect of a distempered brain: besides, sir, you have by this means laid yourself open to a prosecution in the ecclesiastical court, which will either oblige you publicly to recant what you have said, or give up your possessions in the Church.' 'My Lord,' answered the Dean, 'I never either think, act, or write anything, for which I am afraid to be called to an account before any tribunal upon earth; and if I am to be prosecuted for discharging the duties of my function, I will suffer patiently the severest penalties in justification of it.' And so saying, the Dean retired with some emotion, and left the two noblemen as much in the dark as ever. Lord Kildare went home, and sent for a proctor of the spiritual court, to whom he committed the Dean's letter, and ordered a citation to be sent to him as soon as possible. In the meantime the Archbishop, who knew the Dean had a family to provide for, and foresaw that ruin must attend his entering into a suit with so powerful a person, went to his house, and recommended him to ask my Lord's pardon, before the matter

became public. 'Ask his pardon,' said the Dean, 'why the man is dead!' 'What! Lord Kildare dead!' 'No, Lord Rosse.' 'Good God,' said the Archbishop, 'did you not send a letter yesterday to Lord Kildare?' 'No, truly, my Lord, but I sent one to the unhappy Earl of Rosse, who was then given over, and I thought it my duty to write to him in the manner I did.' Upon examining the servant, the whole mistake was rectified, and the Dean saw, with real regret, that Lord Rosse died as he had lived; nor did he continue in this life above four hours after he sent off the letter. The poor footman lost his place by the jest, and was, indeed, the only sufferer for my Lord's last piece of humour."—Vol. iii. pp. 252-255.

Accounts of Leinster House, now the Royal Dublin Society, of Kildare street, Dawson street, St. Andrew's church, Suffolk street, Hog Hill (now St. Andrew street,) Church lane, Trinity lane (now Trinity street,) and William street, close the third of these important volumes.

We look upon Mr. Gilbert's book, as the most important and valuable contribution to our literature which has been made for many years, and we think it entitled to equal rank with any Irish historical work that has ever appeared. Two misconceptions appear to prevail with reference to this work; one, an idea that it is exclusively local in its narrative and its interest, and the other that it is merely a collection of anecdotes illustrative of Dublin life in past years, brought together to form an amusing book.

We think we have already written enough, and extracted with sufficient liberality from Mr. Gilbert's pages, to correct the former mistake. In truth, though styled and intended as a history of our chief city, it illustrates most ably and forcibly the concurrent history of the country at large, and of the noble, illustrious, and remarkable families and men, who at any time were connected by birth or residence with the metropolis.

Relieved and illustrated with recondite and interesting narratives, it is a history in the widest meaning of the word; a history, that while we read calls up before our mental eyes the very forms and features of the men who fought and wrote, and spoke and suffered in other days: the mansions and buildings that have long ago crumbled into dust, rise like the enchanted castles at the wave of the magician's wand, and the old days of Dublin before its brilliancy was destroyed by centralization, come back to light once more.

I see rich Bagdad once again,
With its turrets of Moorish mould,
And the Khalif's twice five hundred men,
Whose binishes flamed with gold.
I call up many a gorgeous show,
Which the pall of oblivion hides—
All passed like snow, long, long ago,
With the time of the Barmecides!

These volumes contain a history of every individual and family of any note whose names occur in connection with the city of Dublin, either as inhabitant or native: and in it will be found traced to their earliest dates accounts of every church, convent, abbey or institution, which ever existed in Dublin. It contains a history of the drama in Dublin exceeding any published work in accuracy of detail and newness of information; it gives us a history of our progress in music, painting, and sculpture, and of every man eminent in these arts who dwelt or grew famous within the city. It is moreover a complete political history of Dublin, and thus necessarily of Ireland.

Every extant document bearing on the subject of the work and on the general history of the country appears to have been examined by the author: including the ancient MSS. in the old Irish language, unpublished Anglo-Norman documents in Latin and French, the MSS. in the State Paper Office, London, and a vast amount of local muniments existing only in manuscript.

We are ourselves aware that the production of such a work, owing to its having been so long neglected, was almost despaired of by those best qualified to judge, and the most profound of our historic investigators have freely acknowledged their surprize and gratification at the admirable result of the author's labours, the vast extent of which will be appreciated by a reference to the elaborate catalogues appended of the authorities on which each of his chapters is based.

One highly gratifying fact is made abundantly clear by Mr. Gilbert's volumes, and for the elucidation of which he has a claim upon the gratitude of his countrymen. He has established the proud and honourable position of Dublin in past years, as the parent of a numerous line of worthies in literature and art. In no part of the world was excellence in either better appreciated than in Dublin, and though perhaps the greater wealth of other

countries tempted many to seek their fortunes there, most of those whose names are mentioned by Mr. Gilbert with honourable notice were content to live and die in their native city. Not that they received perhaps the encouragement and patronage which was their due. The wealthy are not always the most forward patrons of art, and a *Mæcenas* was rare in those days as in the days of Horace, or in our own; but it furnishes an incontestible proof of an innate love of art, and of a refined and intellectual turn in the inhabitants of Dublin, of the times we allude to, to find such numerous and remarkable additions to the ranks of the artists made from amongst their families: We invite the reader to peruse the catalogues of works in painting, sculpture, drawing, and architectural designs, exhibited by the society of artists in Ireland in the years 1765 and 1780 respectively, and which will be found in the appendix to Mr. Gilbert's third volume. It is a pleasing characteristic of the pictures mentioned in these catalogues that the landscape painters appear in nearly every instance to have selected Irish scenery for the subject of their pictures. Nor were literature and poetry neglected or forgotten; this is abundantly testified, not to speak of writers of note, by the numerous shops of booksellers and publishers, amongst the most successful in a commercial sense, of any of the Dublin traders. These publishers too, were constantly engaged in the production of important and voluminous works, and no better illustration of the literary tone of those days can be supplied than the readiness and ability with which any topic of public interest was made the subject of clever pamphlets and satirical poems. Extracts from various of these productions (elsewhere, probably wholly unattainable) will be found scattered through Mr. Gilbert's pages.

Drawing to the close of our task, we are tempted to hope that the day is gone by in which it could be truly imputed as a reproach to the Irish people, that they were wont to prefer everything foreign to anything Irish, and when it would be prudent for an Irish artist, competing in his own country to conceal his nationality and assume that of another land. We have here a book written by an Irishman, upon a subject of peculiar interest, and strictly national. Indebted to nothing save his own industry, research, and acquirements, he has produced a work original in idea, unimpeachable in

accuracy, and matchless in general execution. Let us hope that the encouragement and favour accorded to his labours, will stimulate him to further exertion, and call forth other labourers in the same or adjoining fields.

And now taking leave of our author we return to the everyday life of Dublin.

The men and things called up before us, and with whose forms and features we had begun to grow familiar, fade away, one by one—the secret plottings of political conspirators in back rooms in retired streets, the glare of torches carried by the running footmen, the whirl of the carriages conveying their occupants to ball and theatre, the brilliant club houses with their dashing and daring bloods, the quiet bookshops with their coteries of literary gossips, all sink again into the past, but not to be forgotten. They will be recalled to life by every reader of this book in connection with the stirring recollections of those times and of that city, of which it is so able, so accurate, and so complete a chronicle.

ART. II.—1. *Adam Bede*. By George Eliot. London : Blackwood.

2. *Bulletin de l'Hôpital des Enfants Trouvés*.

IN the literary world lately there has been a *sensation*. The last new novel proved worth reading. Here was an event of magnitude, and still more when the work proved to be anonymous, the name on the title page being only a *nom de plume*. All minds were bent to find out the mystery, and all attempts at solving it only made it deeper. In vain does *Mr. Liggins* excite the sympathy of the public by descriptions of the hard usage of Messrs. Blackwood. His piteous statement is shattered to the winds by the stern contradiction of George Eliot, and *Mr. Liggins*, discomfited, draws into shade, and the unknown pursues his path of obscurity. Is he emulous of the Wizard of the North?

The former work by this author, “*Scenes of Clerical*

Life," gave little promise of the great talent to be afterwards displayed.

Adam Bede is a remarkable book ; its depth of pathos, its piquancy of wit, its minuteness, its life-like description, will seldom, if ever, be equalled.

Does any one want to transport himself into English village life, some forty years ago, when "*Bony*" and his doings were the political talk of the day, when wheaten bread was a great luxury, when men travelled seldom, and then soberly and slowly in stage coaches? No iron line cut across the smooth meadows of England, no gang of navvies brought desolation into many a peaceful village. No gold fields in far off colonies tempted the strong arms and hearts of England's yeomen from her side. War kept the population under, and men were thankful to stay in their own homes, and die in the place in which they had been born.

Is it not hard to realize all this in these days of bustle and rapidity, when the telegraph stretches under the heaving ocean, when the shrill whistle of the engine is shouting by day and night, when we shake hands with our intimate friends near the Pyramids, and go a two months "trip" to Jerusalem ; when the country teems, and is overloaded with her sons, and sends them out to people her vast colonies, when luxuries are multiplied on every side, is it not hard, we say, to realize the quiet old steady England of our great grandfathers and grandmothers?

The pages of Adam Bede will bring it back to us, will paint it far better than by pictures, will let us hear those sweet and soothing sounds that linger in our remembrance of childhood.

"But there is always a stronger sense of life when the sun is brilliant after rain ; and now he is pouring down his beams, and making sparkles among the wet straw, and lighting up every patch of vivid green moss on the red tiles of the cowshed, and turning even the muddy water that is hurrying along the channel to the drain, into a mirror for the yellow-billed ducks, who are seizing the opportunity of getting a drink with as much body in it as possible. There is quite a concert of noises ; the great bull-dog, chained against the stables, is thrown into jealous exasperation by the unwary approach of a cock too near the mouth of his kennel, and sends forth a thundering bark, which is answered by the foxhounds, shut up in the opposite cowhouse ; the old top-knotted hens, scratching with their chicks among the straw, set up a sympathetic croak-

ing as the discomfited cock joins them ; a sow, with her brood, all very muddy, as to the legs, and curled as to the tail, throws in some deep staccato notes ; our friends the calves are bleating from the home croft ; and, under all, a fine ear discovers the continuous hum of human voices."

But Adam Bede has deeper meanings, and better lessons, than pictures of country life. It takes us behind the scenes of those still looking happy homes. The feelings of the human heart are laid bare with as an unerring skill as the notes of nature. The old avaricious squire, with his elaborate polish of manner, which even the villagers come to see through, the farmer's wife, with her "untaught wit," the village schoolmaster, the Scotch gardener, and last, not least, the rector, are drawn with a master's hand. That rector, how true a type of the English clergyman, the true and real production of the Established Church, what countless memories of others like to him does not his portrait draw forth ! The free-hearted, genial, cultivated *gentleman*, having a kindly interest in the villagers around him, being looked up to by them as a "raal gentleman," who reads a sermon to them every Sunday, and sees after their bodily wants every winter. The very faintest notion of the *priest* is absent, and the good folks of forty years ago would have stared indeed at some of the notions of the present day. The peasant's idea of anything like stirring religion was in that of Methodism. Mostly those who were *roused* became Dissenters, and refreshed their souls with the more exciting sermons and prayers of their meetings, rather than the somewhat cold addresses of their gentlemanly rector. Methodism of these days is clearly delineated by our author ; the period, he says, of that "lingering after-glow, from the time when Wesley and his fellow-labourers fed on the hips and haws of the coral hedges, after exhausting limbs and lungs in carrying a divine message to the poor." Ere the tale closes the author gives us hints that the "after-glow" has begun to sink in gloom ; the natural and inevitable end of all revivals out of the true Church.

It is necessary for us briefly to trace the outline of the story ere we can show the depth of the lesson and the loveliness of the teaching which is its moral. Adam Bede is a young carpenter, with an intelligence and mind beyond his station, and an integrity and uprightness of

character joined to it, which made him the pride of his old querulous mother, the object of respect in his village, and worthy of the friendship even of Arthur Donnithorne, nephew and heir to the old squire, and who designs, when he comes into his estate, to load Adam with benefits. In this same Hayslope there dwells, alas, the "Helen," who is to be the apple of discord in the peaceful village. Hetty Sorrel, the orphan niece of Mr. Poyser, a well-to-do and respected farmer, is a beauty, of a kind which our author tells us cannot be described, but of that intoxicating nature, capable of turning the heads of the wisest men; it does that of Adam Bede; but to his deep love of two years' standing, Hetty, coquette as well as beauty, vouchsafes no return, while one glance of Captain Donnithorne, the young handsome scented *gentleman*, wins back favour in return. Hetty has no heart, but her vanity is touched, vistas of dress and carriages, and "to be a lady," open themselves before her imagination, and so the stolen meetings in the wood take place. Arthur Donnithorne is not a *roué*; on the contrary, he has noble and fine qualities, and as this new passion gains on him his conscience is keenly alive, and in its very early stages he resolves to "open his heart," and by pouring the tale into the ear of Mr. Irvine, his rector and friend, find a way of escape.

At this juncture we may pause. Had Arthur been a Catholic he would then have been saved; but he was not a Catholic, there was no priest, knowing well the windings and deceptions of the human heart underneath the smooth, gay, outward bearing; there was no open confessional for him to kneel in, showing by that very act, that sin or temptation lay on the soul. There was only the genial, warm-hearted friend to whom Arthur could apply, and let us see how he fared.

"Arthur Donnithorne, you remember, is under an engagement with himself to go and see Mr. Irvine this Friday morning, and he is awake and dressing so early that he determines to go before breakfast instead of after. The rector, he knows, breakfasts alone at half-past nine, the ladies of the family having a different breakfast hour. Arthur will have an early ride over the hill and breakfast with him. One can say everything best over a meal.

"The progress of civilization has made a breakfast or a dinner an easy or cheerful substitute for more troublesome and disagreeable ceremonies. We take a less gloomy view of four errors now

our father confessor listens to us over his egg and coffee. We are more distinctly conscious that rude penances are out of the question for gentlemen in an enlightened age; and that mortal sin is not incompatible with an appetite for mummies; an assault on our pockets, which in more barbarous times would have been made in the brusque form of a pistol-shot is quite a well-bred and smiling procedure now it has become a request for a loan thrown in as an easy parenthesis between the second and third glasses of claret.

"Still there was this advantage in the old rigid forms, that they committed you to the fulfilment of a resolution by some outward deed: when you have put your mouth to one end of a hole in a stone wall, and are aware that there is an expectant ear at the other end, you are more likely to say what you came out with, the intention of saying, than if you were seated with your legs in an easy attitude under the mahogany, with a companion who will have no reason to be surprised if you have nothing particular to say."

After this preface we are not surprised to find Arthur's secret remains untold. When he finds Mr. Irvine at his comfortable breakfast, surrounded by his dogs, "the confidence which he had thought quite easy before suddenly appeared the most difficult thing in the world to him, and at the very moment of shaking hand he saw his purpose in quite a new light." However he does try to lead the conversation gradually to the point, but no sooner is that gained, no sooner is he colouring with shame, and wanting but one or two questions to help him on, than Mr. Irvine's delicacy takes alarm, he thinks he is coming too near private matters that no man has a right to touch in another, and *changes the conversation*. Poor Arthur's case! how the tempter rejoiced in that moment.

A few weeks after this Arthur is summoned to his regiment; the day before he goes Adam Bede catches him in the act of kissing Hetty in the wood; a fight ensues; Arthur learns for the first time Adam's love for the little beauty; he positively denies having meant more than a passing flirtation, and at Adam's demand writes a letter to Hetty, bidding her think no more of him, which Adam is to give her as soon as Arthur is gone. Adam does give the letter, and, to his astonishment, from that day, instead of Hetty's growing pale and sickly, she only seems inclined to smile on him; there was, being different
in her eyes, in the expr on
ments, Adam thought—
childlike." "But that,"
It's because she's had h n

At last Adam gets courage to tell his tale, and Hetty accepts him, and all mutual friends are pleased, and they are to be married in March, having been betrothed in November, when the wedding clothes will be ready and the cottage furnished; for, as Mrs. Poyser remarks, "Christian folks can't be married like cuckoos."

But February comes and a great dread and a great sorrow come on Hetty, and she droops and looks ill, and says she should like a change; would like to go and see "Dinah" (the Methodist preacher at Stoniton) for a week; and she goes away, but not to Dinah; she goes to Windsor to find Arthur, and it is a long journey, and she makes such mistakes as a simple village girl, for the first time a traveller, might make, and at length she gets to Windsor with her last shilling, and then she learns that Arthur with his regiment is gone to Ireland, so she sells the jewelled locket and earrings he had given her, and sets off again towards Dinah's home, not meaning to go there, but to find some "dark shrouded pool," in the midst of fields, where no one would think of looking for her. The chapter describing her wandering is magnificently written.

Her prolonged absence makes Adam go to fetch her, and he soon learns she is in prison for child-murder. Yes, it is true, that pretty soft girlish thing has left her little child to die in the cold fields. The sequel of the story we must leave our readers to discover for themselves. It is at this point that the story connects itself with the other work at the heading of this article. It may have seemed strange to link the dry statistics and report of a well-known French institution with the last new novel of the day; and yet few can have read Adam Bede, and arrived at Hetty's trial, without a longing that an "Enfants Trouvés" were erected in England; for had there been one, it was there Hetty would have bent her steps. What she says in her broken confession is said by many thousand unhappy ones like her, "The thought came into my mind that I might get rid of it and go home again. The thought came all of a sudden as I was lying in bed, and it got stronger and stronger. I longed so to go back again. I couldn't bear being so lonely and coming to beg for want. I thought I should get rid of all my misery and go back home, and never let 'em know why I ran away. I don't know how I felt about the baby. I seemed to hate it—it was like a heavy weight hanging round my neck."

It is a favourite saying in our moral England, that the existence of the *Enfans Trouvés* proves an incentive to crime. Few words are needed to demonstrate the absurdity of this answer. How few even of those who marry pause to think what will be the fate they are preparing for their helpless children; and if then those who have some fear of God before their eyes are so regardless, will the children of sin, the minds heated with passion, those whose God is self-indulgence, be likely to be restrained by this consideration? Oh, no! and if any doubts, facts speak for themselves. In France the institution for forsaken children exists, and in England it does not. Are there fewer illegitimate children in the latter or in the former country? "No," say statistics. Where are these children then? Where are the children in England, who, if they were French, would fill the *Hôpital des Enfants Trouvés*? In their graves, murdered by the mother who gave them birth. Most awful fact. The crime of infanticide is rife amongst us, one of the most common of our national sins. In France that crime is almost *unknown*. And let us look for a while to the fearful temptation the English woman has to commit the crime. Let us imagine one in that too common case seduced with promise of marriage, who finds herself betrayed. Hitherto, with successful skill, she has concealed all, and borne with iron endurance the heavy suffering of many months; but the hour is at hand when concealment is no longer possible, and shame, and scorn, and outcasting glare before her, and the tempter is by her side, and the mother's instinct is choked within her, and the deed is done, the dark deed which stamps her in her own eyes as lost for ever; she bears no mark before men, but the curse of God is written in her heart. Before that hour perchance there was a hope of forgiveness, a remembrance of the Magdalene, a haunting tone of the words that Jesus spoke against a proud and scornful world, "*Go and sin no more*;" an eager longing for days of innocence to return, a swelling up of the first drops that might have become tears of repentance; but now it is over, no more hope, past repentance now, only a dull torturing remorse. If there were an "*Enfans Trouvés*," where the unhappy mother might hide her infant, would this be so? No, answer some, but then she will sin again, she will sink deeper into vice. Alas, will the guilt of murder, murder of her own child, be a barrier against further corruption?

Will not the state of mind we have described be most likely to induce her to give herself more entirely to Satan's power, that he may work his will in her? Her social position is lost, is it not most likely that she will rush wildly on in the career of vice?

On the other hand, if there be a refuge to which she can take the child, will not the maternal instinct be awakened, may not the knowledge of the woe she has brought on that helpless child make her shrink back from again doing the like? It is difficult to conceive that when the wretched mother goes to leave her infant at the *Eufans Trouvés*,—knowing that it, though wretched, dirty, forsaken, oftentimes diseased, is taken in at once and tended lovingly,—not for hire, but by those who might be enjoying the fair things of earth, who might have had their own children playing around them, but who have foregone all this, that the orphan may find in them a mother and the forsaken a home,—she can be unsoftened and untouched. A chance of redemption is afforded her. If she make herself known at the *Hôpital* assistance is given her to enable her to support herself, so that starvation shall not be an excuse for crime. Were that same thing done in England, how many hundreds, aye, thousands, would be arrested in that course of sin which brings body and soul to hell!

Supposing she rejects this chance and goes on headlong in evil, still in some moment, perchance only in the death hour a hope may return to her,—that hope, that faith, for lack of which the sinner is so often lost,—hope and faith in the longsuffering of God. No hope for me, cries the dying sinner; no hope for thee, echos the devil by her side, and the guardian angel is so far off she cannot hear his sighing whisper. Men have despised her, she is outcast from their homes, and her presence would pollute their doorway, and then there comes a memory of the *Eufans Trouvés* of the sweet face of the *Soeur de Charité*, who tended her poor little baby. That child, perhaps, has been taught to pray for its lost mother. If they, the children of earth had such pity, shall not the Infinite? Who knows whether thoughts like these may not at last bring contrition, faint and feeble indeed; but who may sound the depth of His mercy?

We have been the more induced to make these remarks, from some facts that came to our knowledge some time back.

Some of those enterprising fellow countrymen of ours who

now and then diversify the round of the foreign sightseeing of picture galleries, palaces, and monuments, by peeping into some of the institutions of Catholic charity, went one day to the Hôpital des Enfants Trouvés, in Paris. After this they came home and wrote a letter to one of the newspapers, with the endeavour of "exposing" this institution to the well-merited contempt it deserved. The Parisians had no "*Times*," they said, to point out their abuses to them, so they were allowed to go on in gross ignorance of the horrors perpetrated in this establishment.

The children were dirty, crying, neglected, and diseased in one ward, in another evidently dying, and the nurse told them that most of them did die. Will it be believed, that these truth-loving English people never learnt, or at least never published the fact, that the ward they first entered was the "receiving ward," in which the children are placed until they are examined by the medical men? In this ward they never remain more than a day or two. These children come in, of course, from the "Tour," or are found in the streets by the police, dirty, squalid, and diseased. The doctors examine them, a certain number are found to be radically diseased, to be paying a terrible penalty for their parents sin, and are thus rendered dangerous to the health of a wet nurse; they then go into the second, or diseased ward, and as might be expected, *do* mostly die.

The others are sent into the country to wet nurses to be suckled, and then brought up for some years among the peasant women's own children; after these years they return to Paris to enter the orphanage, where they are educated.

It was our lot not very long since to pay a visit to the Enfants Trouvés, and having our enterprising friend's letter in our minds, we did go prepared to see some things contrary to English ideas of comfort, some slight foundation for the heavy charges brought against the institution. We went purposely without introduction and without passports. We were not prepared then to be shown into spacious *Salles*, long lofty rooms, as spotlessly clean as a queen's nursery, each with rows of little cots, with its white curtains and linen, and with every appearance of ease and comfort.

The children were crying certainly, and there was not a nurse to each child, and the children were not healthy-looking; but this was explained by the system of the Institution; so much then for our truth-loving country people. We should recommend them for the future to spend their energies in a great city where there *is* a *Times* and find out what becomes of the *Enfants Trouvés* in London, to visit the workhouse nurseries, and see if they will bear a comparison. Let them be assured there are abuses enough at home and those who live in glass houses must not throw stones.

To come to a practical question, is or is not the *Hôpital des Enfants Trouvés* worthy of our imitation? From the time of the great Constantine, Christian charity has flowed forth in this channel, it was brought to its perfection by that great saint, Vincent de Paul, who knew so well the wants of the poor and the remedies against sin. The story upon which Adam Bede is grounded is no longer a solitary and startling instance; in all parts of England this horrible crime is constantly committed.

We are not forgetting the existence of the Foundling Hospital (so called) in London, but it is small indeed compared with the one in Paris; *interest* is required to gain admission for a child, so that in fact it refuses to receive any "foundlings."

The charity of the *Enfants Trouvés* spreads over France, and into all Catholic countries, and the "Tour" and the door are open to every unfortunate child.

Sometimes a striking tale may have the effect of bringing some startling truth before the mind in a manner a dry detail would fail to do, and we trust this may be the case with Adam Bede and that its hearty vigorous pages may impress on the minds of Englishmen the stern necessity of doing something to avert the progress of that frightful crime of infanticide which is spreading like a plague-spot over our land.

- ART. III.—1. *Utopias Desmascaradas do Systema Liberal.* Lisbon, 1857.
2. *Portugal and Galicia.* By the Earl of Carnarvon. Third edition. London, Murray, 1848.
3. *Recollections of an Excursion to the Monasteries of Alcobaca and Batalha.* By the author of Vathek. London, Bentley, 1835.
4. *Portugal Illustrated.* By the Rev. W. M. Kinsey, B.D., Fellow of Trinity College and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord Auckland. London, Treuttel, Würtz, and Richter, Soho Square. 1828.

“THE Popes need nothing but the truth,” was the significant motto which Father de Ravignan, whose loss we so recently lamented in these pages, prefixed to his history of Clement XIII. and XIV. We adopt this maxim and make it our own on the present occasion. It enunciates a principle which it is well for us in the discussion of Catholic difficulties not to disregard. It lays down a rule which is not only bold but wise, and wise because it is bold. It is our boast that the history of the Catholic Church can bear the full uneclipsed light of day, because we well know, how out of investigations the most searching and the most hostile criticisms, she ever comes, despite the grievous weaknesses of poor humanity, bright with a supernatural brightness. In treating of Catholic affairs at home or abroad, we are, if we may be allowed to make this prefatory avowal, partizans indeed, pledged in faith and honour and in hearty love to the cause of the Church, in her defence thorough and uncompromising, but yet not inclined to be led, by a false delicacy or by a mistaken principle, blind-fold through the world. We must rub off the flattering unction wherewith self-love or timidity has besmeared our eyes. It has been somewhat too much the fashion in our own day to gloss over the short-comings, the failings, or even the casual corruptions, that have befallen any Catholic institution in its conflict with men or from its contact with the infirmities of human nature. The fault, where it exists, is due to the inherent weakness of humanity, the good alone belongs to the institution. Ill-success is not of necessity a crime, and even when it may be such, for us to probe a wound is not to inflict an injury.

Frankly and fearlessly we must meet the calumnies of the world and the lying tongues of our enemies with the naked truth. It is our sole, as well as our best weapon. We must not deal in palliatives ; their use is too often an indignity to the Church instead of a defence of her honour. If anything be amiss in one or other of our most glorious institutions, no matter in what quarter of the globe, let us meet the accusation of the enemy, and check his false triumph by a candid avowal of the truth, and by an exposition of the cause of failure or fall. If beneath a cowl lurk another Luther, let us ourselves tear the mask from the face of the offender. If even in the twelve the adversary recognized and claimed his Iscariot, ought we to be surprised that now and again in our day he is able with unflinching instinct to ferret out and hail as his own an apostate monk or a Judas-like priest ? We have nothing to conceal, we are free to confess that from time to time evil days have come upon the Church, that her brightness has been clouded awhile by the dark mists, that have risen like a malaria from the rank and foul corruption of human hearts. We own that Arius triumphed for a time, and tore from the unity of faith and plunged into hopeless error more than one-third of the Church of God. We grant that worldly-mindedness, a spirit of timid subserviency and sinful luxury, characterized the clergy of our own land and made them an easy prey to the corrupting arts and savage violence of King Henry the Eighth, and though the confession wound our heart, we must acknowledge that corruption has too often crept like a canker even into the heart of a monastery and made it a plague-spot on earth and an eyesore to God. But what then ? Has Catholic truth suffered in the keeping of the Church ? Has it dwindled down to dead or dry formulas or been dwarfed in its divine growth ? The denial of the godless Arius brought about the glorious definition of Nicæa. Did the promulgation of Protestantism, as was the hope of the Reformers, upset the Church ? Did it not rather quicken her zeal ? Did it not serve as a wholesome warning in revealing to Europe the sad effects of clerical degeneracy in England and Germany ? Do we not with reason cherish as the very apple of our eye the monastic orders, though they have drawn down upon their devoted heads the wrath of our enemies, not because of their incidental laxity, but on the contrary, because of their charac-

teristic self-denial and holiness? It is not the wealth indeed, not the magnificence, not the external splendour, and grand hospitality, nor the munificent almsgiving, nor the enlightened encouragement of husbandry, not even the leadership in letters and patronage of art, it is not so much these things we desire to see revived in our day; but rather do we wish to have our monastic orders restored to us in the spirit of their ancient mortification, and in their accustomed way of the cross; to behold them, in their new resurrection, shine out again with the brightness of holy poverty. Let them win back the land they have lost, let them push out on the troubled waters of the world, still the turmoil, and where the flood has subsided, plant the cross anew. We want active orders to fight the busy world with its own weapons—indomitable energy and undying perseverance. We want to see them in possession of the schools, and in the halls of the university. Or the education question we would have them dispute every inch of ground with the State, lay bare its insidious encroachments, or ward off its undisguised attacks. We would have them cooperate with the laity in creating a modern literature to equal in grace and to surpass in depth of thought the hostile or impious productions of the day. Let them evoke the spirit of genius, and following the poet in his inspiration or the wisdom of philosophy, strike out for themselves a newer path or a higher field than the nineteenth century has yet afforded. Let them with the sages of the world ascend the lonely watch-towers of science and grapple with their solution of its difficulties. Let them combat the timidity of ignorance, repress the speculations of the rash and refute the conclusions of unbelief. To achieve such a work, to-day is the opportune day. It is the need of the age. Our generation is beside itself in pursuit of knowledge. It sets no store on ancient truth. It is in love with the new. The glitter of novelty has a charm which none may resist. We have wandered in our day upon the dark paths of science and in search after the fruit of life, have fallen upon the tree of evil knowledge. Who shall lead us out of the maze of the gloomy forest, out of those tangled thickets inaccessible to light? For the high-priests of science are not the disciples of the cross. Triumphant over the bitter hate of an Atheistic philosophy and the impious unbelief of ignorance what a noble example has not the clergy of France

set the world? Despoiled of wealth, of power, of political influence, by the ruthless hand of the first Revolution, with no earthly arm to protect them, no voice lifted up in their behalf, they have yet during the past fifty years regained a hold upon the heart and the intellect of their nation which no adversity has shaken, no revolution loosened.

But we stand even more in need of contemplative orders to withdraw themselves from the stirring scene of life to a solitude like of the desert, and act as a counterpoise in the scales of divine justice, against those multitudinous gatherings of men, whose hearts are solely set, with all the fierce ardour of our untamed nature, on the passion for gold, on the pursuit of pleasure, or on the less ignoble but more entrancing schemes of ambition. We want men devoted to the divine ordinance of prayer, engaged in the contemplation of the unseen glories of God. We want them to ascend the holy mount and, like Moses, to lift up their hands in behalf of the low-lying valleys. Perhaps the greatest debt this age owes to God is the debt of unaccomplished prayer. Do we even pay the *interest*? Does not the world rather repudiate the divine obligation? We have on our hearts still something to confess, but, O! rejoice not, ye men of little faith, over our confession. We have to acknowledge, alas, that now and again, through the long course of history and in evil days, the hand even of Peter has quivered, his foot has strayed from the direct path, and his heart fallen under the stress of temptation; but his bark, nevertheless, and therefore we rejoice at the manifest power of God, has never once swerved from its course, and was never stranded on the shoals of error. And now we have done with our confessions; but let us add that though, almost within our own times, a bishop consecrated to God was seen to break his crozier and trample the cross under foot; and that later on we have seen a pure-minded priest, once glorious in the sanctuary, fall, in the pride of his intellect, like a second Tertullian; yet do we not abate our love and faith in priest or bishop one jot or tittle on account of the sin of a Talleyrand, or because of the fall of an Abbé de Lamennais. We are not now afraid to own, to close in with the brief inquiry it is our intention to pursue, that the church of Portugal has fallen upon evil days, and wandered upon forbidden paths. Nor are we ashamed to avow, though

of course it is needless to say how grieved, that Jansenistical in principle and loose in morals, the priesthood for the most part, and many of the bishops, are entangled in the meshes of a secret society condemned by the Holy See. Unmindful of their sacred calling, and unrestrained by the Papal decrees, they are like all the government officials in Portugal, affiliated members of the Free Mason lodges. But we shall perhaps better understand, or at least be more readily able to account for the now fallen condition, ecclesiastical and civil, of Portugal, once in its zeal the joy of the Church, and in its prosperity the glory of the earth, if we pass in rapid review some of the leading events in its history during the last century. At the commencement of that period it had but just recovered, after an almost bloodless revolution, from the effects of the ill-judged and wasting tyranny of Spain. During that cruel and melancholy subjugation, Portugal, so often and so justly styled the Phœnicia of the Atlantic, had forfeited almost the whole of her colonial empire, and lost much of her extended commerce. Her trade had declined, and her native industry had dwindled almost to nothing. The Dutch supplanted her in the East Indies, and proved formidable rivals even in the Brazils. Her heavily-laden argosies cumbered no more the banks of the Tagus, nor spread their rich sails from the mouth of the Douro. But yet under John the Fifth her commerce somewhat revived, and entering into a close alliance with Great Britain, she enjoyed a period of comparative prosperity. Animated by the wretched Gallican principles which prevailed in the parliament of Paris, and in the degraded court of Spain, the sovereign of Portugal, absolute in the state, strove, with insatiable ambition, to invest himself with the spiritual supremacy belonging to Rome. He founded a Patriarchate at Lisbon, and lavished upon it a regal endowment. The celebrated and magnificent monastic buildings at Alcobaça owed their renewed lustre to his munificence and ambition. He sought to eclipse the splendour of Rome, and following the bent of the times in which he lived, and the bad example of the Bourbon princes, encroached upon the rights of the Holy See, and infringed on the discipline of the Church. He thus made straight the way for the coming of Pombal, one of the precursors of the Revolution of 1789, who by his ecclesiastical and civil tyranny anticipated some of its worst acts. This

inveterate hater of the great institute of Jesus never rested day nor night until he had not only rooted it out of the kingdom of Portugal, but had brought about, with the aid of the infidel party in France, the entire abolition of the order. In this struggle his pride and avarice were alike called into play. The accumulated possessions of the Jesuits tempted his greed for riches, while his proud spirit was unable to brook their stubborn enduring efforts to balk his encroaching despotism in church and state. The rebukes of the Jesuit preachers launched against the immorality of the court, by enraging the king and his courtiers, strengthened the arm of their arch-enemy. They fell by his triumphant hand, and were cast, to the number of eight hundred, in a state of extreme destitution, upon the hospitality of the Papal shores.

"The infidel party in Europe," says an able writer, alluding to the suppression of this famous order, "was the well-known author of this work of destruction, in which it was but too well seconded by the Jansenists. The first blow was struck in Portugal in the year 1752. The tyrannical minister, Pombal, in despite of the clearest evidence to the contrary, feigned a conspiracy on the part of the Jesuits against the king's life, accused, among others, one who was then actually confined to his bed in an asylum, instituted an arbitrary state inquisition, which on the most ridiculous charges imprisoned many of these religious, and executed some others. The property of the whole order in Portugal was confiscated, and its members cast upon the shores of the Papal States."*

The morality of the country had sunk to a very low ebb. The people were idle and enervated; the nobility deserting their estates and their duties in the provinces, crowded to the luxurious capital, and gave themselves up to the pursuit of unlawful pleasure, and indulged in the most vicious excesses. The king himself, worn out with voluptuous self-indulgence, was a mere tool in the hands of his unscrupulous minister, who adroitly held him in subjection, by alternately awakening his dread of assassination, and encouraging his love of pleasure. Who dare describe the state of Lisbon after nightfall? Unprotected against

* Public Lectures on Ancient and Modern History, by James Burton Robertson, Esq., Professor of Modern History.

unbridled license, the stillness of its night was too often broken by the wild shrieks of despair, or the savage cries of vengeance. Who shall tell of the blood spilt in the dark, now in the heat of passion, now in cold-blooded treachery? Was no warning Voice to be heard? Was there no listening Ear, no ever watchful Eye? Where was the Hand to write on the wall the prophetic judgment of God? Alas, how awful was the calamity which burst, without a moment's warning, over the guilty city. On All Saints' day, in the year 1755, just as the clock had finished striking nine, and the church bells had barely ceased ringing for the High Mass, the earth shook, and in an instant Lisbon was a heap of ruins. Thousands had fled to the banks of the Tagus, and to the quays for refuge, when suddenly, the river rose, like the ocean in its might, and swept these pale men and weeping women away in a whirlpool of fury. Here, as is not seldom the case in times of extreme terror, when, like seamen, who, "with draughts intemperate on the sinking deck, set their fate at defiance," the wild frenzy of despair now seized the surviving population. Recognising no restraint, obeying no law human or divine, lust, rapine, and murder, roamed over the devoted city. The bonds of society were loosened, and man seemed flung back for awhile into the state of savage life. Pombal, the great minister, was equal to the crisis. His genius was, under the emergency, displayed to full advantage. It was his boast that he found Lisbon a heap of ruins, and left her the admiration of the world. Under his long administration Portugal advanced again in material prosperity, but he undermined the faith and sapped the foundations of religion, and left his country an easy prey to the wild passions and to the fatal catastrophe which, at the close of the eighteenth century, shook Europe to its centre. With the fall of Pombal, at the death of Don Joseph, his showy but unstable system, crumbled to pieces. Not so, however, unhappily, his plan of education. His influence at the University of Coimbra long survived his fall. The innumerable professorships he had founded and endowed perpetuated his insidious principles, and propagated his covert infidelity. Education, divorced from sound religious principles, bore in time its natural fruit. It left its own mark on the literature and corrupted the youth of the country. The evil seed was scattered with a prodigal hand, and

when the reapers came to gather in the harvest, they found, instead of the golden wheat, nothing but tares. To Pombal, indeed, as to a first cause, may be traced much of the evil that has since befallen his unfortunate country, the unhappy mother of such a man. To dominate with unchecked despotism in the state did not suffice to satisfy his ungovernable ambition. He encroached upon the rights of Rome, and by interfering with the internal regulations of the Church, in the nomination of bishops, and in the bestowal of benefices, he at first set the Holy See at defiance, and soon after found a pretext for breaking altogether with the Papal Court. His evil influence soon showed itself in the general decay of religious fervour, and in the decline of the ecclesiastical spirit. It was even visible in the laxity that began to prevail about this time in a few of the monastic houses, which, from increase of wealth, or from contiguity to the court, were more open to bad example. In the more than regal magnificence of the monastery of Alcobaça, for instance, were not the rules of St. Bernard relaxed, and the spirit of the order violated? The feudal grandeur of this far-famed regal and monastic residence, the Escorial of Portugal, attracted the notice of the world. It had been the resort of kings in pursuit of pleasure, as well as the refuge of sinners, in the hope of repentance.

Mafra where mass and revel were alternate seen,
The lordling and the frere, illsorted fry, I ween,

says the author of *Childe Harold*; and perhaps, indeed, surrounded by such enervating luxury, it was somewhat difficult, under the sway of a worldly-minded abbot, to preserve the spirit of self-denial, and the accustomed ways of lowliness and mortification. Mafra well deserved its reputation of boundless wealth and splendour. "The revenue of this royal monastery, at the period of my excursion to it," says the elegant author of '*Recollections of Alcobaça and Batalha*,' "considerably exceeded £24,000, and the charities such wealth enabled the monks to dispense, were most amply and judiciously applied. The traces of John the Fifth's munificence were then visible in all their freshness and lustre. Since these golden days of reciprocal good will and confidence between the landlord and the tenant, the master and the servant, what cruel and arbitrary inroads have been made upon individual

happiness ! What almost obsolete oppressions have been revived under newfangled specious names ! What a cold and withering change, in short, has been perpetrated by a well organized system of spoliation, tricked out in the plausible garb of philosophic improvement and general utility ! The library of Alcobaça contained, at the period we are alluding to, 50,000 volumes, of great value, the intellectual product of every country and age, a testimony to the love of literature, and of scientific pursuits, manifested by the inmates of monastic houses, which the ignorance or malignity of later times has so often yet so vainly attempted to conceal or deny. It possessed the first editions of many of the Greek and Roman classics, brilliantly illuminated. But the library of Alcobaça was also renowned for its invaluable collection of manuscripts of the highest antiquity, and of the rarest description. Chronicles and historical records* of the remotest ages, documents of inestimable price, referring to the Moorish invasion, and reaching up to the Gothic times, were all dispersed, or perished, or were purloined, almost under our own eyes, at the unhappy time when the leaders of the Revolution of 1834, suppressed all the monasteries and convents in Portugal. If the sanctity of religion, the rights of property, the virtue of these cloistered men and women, were of no avail in checking the avarice or staying the hand of these reckless upsetters of peace and justice, how could we hope that the monuments of the treasured learning of ages, and the records of the accumulated knowledge of many nations and tribes, should, even for a moment, inspire reverence in the minds of men, ignorant as they were profane ? Carted away under no supervision, like straw in common waggons, much of this invaluable cargo strewed the wayside, or was purloined in transit. It met no better fate at Lisbon ; the scanty remnant of this invaluable library was soon dispersed. Some of the MSS. have found their way to the British Museum, where they may be seen to this day.

To an Englishman especially interesting were some of the books presented at a later period to this monastery, in token of gratitude, by men whose names have become

* Some of the most valuable archives, however, were, during the Spanish subjugation, removed to the Escorial.

famous in English history, or by our fair travelled countrywomen, ever anxious to acknowledge real kindness. Among the presentation books, once carefully preserved in the monastic archives, are to be seen an Oxford edition of Pindar, 1697, a Homer, Glasgow edition, 1756, given by Pitt and Lord Strathmore, after their first visit to the monastery in 1760. A copy of Mickle's *Lusiad*, from Lady H. Frances O'Neill, "in grateful acknowledgment of many and repeated attentions from the Ill^{mos} R^{ms} Su^{res} Religiozos de San Bernado em Alcobaça, London, December 14, 1791. There was also a volume transmitted by Canning, in acknowledgment of hospitalities received, with an elegant Latin inscription, which we are sure our readers will thank us for transcribing.

" In memoriam
Magnificentissimi hospitii
Quo a sanctis Alcobacæ cœnobitis acceptus est
Dierumque apud eos laute beateque actorum,
Mense Martii, A. S. H., 1816,
Librum huncce
Bibliothecæ Alcobacæ adscribendum.
Gratæ recordationis testimonium
Mittit
Georgius Canning."

Let us endeavour for a moment to conjure up before the eye that almost fabulous pile of conventual buildings, crowning the hill with its countless belfries and its square massive towers, out of the centre of which, like the sun breaking from amidst fantastic clouds, rose in magnificence the mighty dome, the best proportioned and lightest in Europe. What an imposing sight must it not have presented to the valley below! Enclosed in an iron globe, on the top of the overshadowing dome, was a portion of the true cross, but how often was that cross forgotten in the buildings below! Adorned with innumerable statues were the corridors and galleries surrounding the immense quadrangular court, out of which opened no fewer than eight hundred and sixty-six apartments. The fathers and lay-brethren, together with the subordinate retainers of the monastery, amounted at this period to four hundred in number. We must, however, regret that the munificence of Don John the Fifth, which was so lavishly expended on the construction and embellishments of the monastic kitchen, bore too evident

a testimony, that with the increase of wealth, the humble fare befitting a religious house had, in the course of time, been somewhat too much forgotten. This noble hall, one hundred feet long, with its finely-groined walls, upwards of sixty feet in height, furnished with every contrivance to carry out extended culinary operations, had obtained quite a European celebrity. It has been described as "the most distinguished temple of gluttony in Europe." How much more do the genuine followers of monastic discipline now rejoice in their present lowly and straitened condition, than in the recollection of the luxury that once surrounded them in this palace of perverted monasticism!

Through the centre of this vast hall, for we will not hesitate (in accordance with the rule we have laid down for ourselves at the commencement of this paper) to probe this unhappy plague-spot in a monastic house, flowed a stream of the clearest water, rich with every sort and size of river fish. Wild-fowl and venison and fruit loaded the broad shelves and covered the long tables in endless profusion. The banqueting hall, removed by a long succession of dimly-lighted galleries from this odorous abode of delicate viands and sauces was, though not so spacious, yet a most sumptuous saloon, adorned with choice pictures and lighted by a profusion of wax tapers in sconces of silver. On festive occasions, or on the arrival of strangers of rank, the banquet itself was, according to the description of one who himself enjoyed the rich feast, in no wise wanting in rarities and delicacies of past seasons and distant countries, exquisite sausages, potted lampreys, strange messes from Brazils, and others still stranger from China, (edible birds' nests and sharks' fins) dressed after the latest mode of Macao by a Chinese lay-brother. These, with a superstructure of "ortolans and quails, lumps of celestial fatness, and sautés and bechamels, beyond praise, and truffle creams," washed down by flasks of most exquisite wine, the produce of a neighbouring and friendly vineyard, made up a rare, and almost, we should imagine, super-aldermanic feast. The rest of the interior arrangements of this monastic house was in keeping with this sample of luxuriousness. Silver ewers and basins abounded, and rich Turkey carpets and velvet hangings and embroidered linen; but we hear little of the hair-shirt and the discipline, of vigils and of fasting. Out of luxuriousness of living springs a general laxity of monastic observances,

and from such relaxation what can we expect but a decay in holy living, especially when, as is the habit with Jansenistical governments, the supervision exercised by Rome is resisted, and when those reforms, which it sometimes finds needful, are thwarted or retarded by the guilty interference of kings?

But as in every sable cloud there is a silver lining, so the strict keeping of the rule and holy reputation of a small community of Capuchins, not far from Carafaiz, served as a relief to the dark shadow cast for a time on the religious name in the monastery we have just been contemplating. Situated on the summit of a very high hill, this Capuchin convent was a favourite place of pilgrimage on the feast of St. Anthony, the patron saint of Portugal. It consisted of from about thirty to forty monks, all young men, many, as we are informed by the author of "*The Recollections*," "with features as regular as the fine Grecian heads on the Syracusan medals, but looking pale and attenuated." Be that as it may, young or old, pale or not, they, like all the poorer orders in Portugal, generally, were in the highest degree exemplary, zealous, charitable, self-devoted, the very fathers of the people. Their church, though spacious, was too small for the multitudes who thronged to hear them preach. Advancing in those magnificent processions, for which their country is so celebrated, they ascended in thousands up this hill, whose summit they completely covered. Every knee was bent, every voice lifted up in prayer, and every eye in this immense multitude glistened with devotion. These religious orders aided the secular clergy, with whom they were on the best of terms, in their ministerial duties, and have left behind abiding traces of their zeal; for to this day, in spite of long wars, foreign and domestic, of revolution and irreligion, and even of clerical scandals, the faith and piety of the Portuguese peasantry are as much a matter of surprise as of joy to the beholder.

But at last and too late the arch-enemy of the monastic orders, the suppressor of the Jesuits, Pombal, went down unlamented to his grave. At the death of Don Joseph the strong arm of his power was broken, and there was none to bandage it. Into his cup of bitterness there was none to pour the sweets of sympathy, for those who had courted him most in success were the first to abandon him in his day of reverse. His fall was a signal of deliverance to thousands

of captives, and from all parts of the land went up a cry for his impeachment. He who had brought ruin and destitution on so many died himself in poverty and disgrace. A quick retribution overtook him. He saw the work of his own hands in the state full to pieces. The world was tired of her favourite, and as is the habit of the world, flung him aside to die. His evil influence alone outlasted his life. And now on a state weakened in its principles of government by centralization and absolutism, and on the Church, whose chief pastors were infected with ultra-Gallican principles, broke the storm of the French Revolution of 1789. What country escaped the ravages of that fatal epoch? What state felt not the shock and the rebound of those principles which the Revolution fulminated from Paris, where anarchy and irreligion celebrated their hideous orgies? Then came the ruthless despot, the eldest born of the Revolution, the conqueror of continental Europe, the tyrant who made the necks of kings and emperors his footstool. War soon wasted the Peninsula. The spoliation of the monasteries, the desecration of the churches, and the wanton destruction of public monuments, showed how much the imperial armies still retained of the old Jacobinical character. Not content with mere plunder, they destroyed what they could not take away, and often committed to the flames the monastery or the church which had served them over night as a barrack. They found no finer prey, they left no greater ruin in all the country, than the grand old monastery of Alcobaça. They stalled their horses in the Church. They overturned the altars. They ransacked the holy places in search of silver and gold, and of the precious stones of the Brazils. The sacred vessels of the altar passed into the hands of Jews, and have since, as magnificent goblets, decorated the sideboard of many a London dining-room. Nothing was too sacred for the savage soldiery, nothing too precious. What to them were relics and sainted shrines? And what the venerable monuments of antiquity? Were they not rich with the diamonds of the Brazils? With the reckless fury that hitherto was believed to belong alone to the barbarian, they disturbed even the resting-place of the dead. They shattered in fragments the magnificent tomb of party-coloured marble, which for ages had covered the remains of a Duke of Braganza. They scattered to the winds all that remained on earth of King John the Great.

On the return of the abbot, at the conclusion of peace, all that could be found of his precious remains was placed, on account of the poverty of the monastery, (how are the mighty fallen!) beneath a tomb of painted wood. The soldiers, in their reckless fury, made a bonfire of the library. The grand old hall was filled with an unwonted light. All gathered round the blaze and fed the flame with whatever came to hand. Illuminated bible, precious chronicle, or ancient manuscript, disappeared in the devouring element. The vaulted roof rang again with the insensate and besotted laughter of a savage soldiery. The Goths and Vandals surprise us no more. The French at their departure, left the grand refectory hall of Alcobaça in flames. It remained a charred and blackened ruin, a monument of departed grandeur. It arrested the eye, and could not fail to interest the poet, who, in *Childe Harold*, so often mourned over fallen greatness. Thus he laments :

“On sloping mounds, or in the vale beneath
Are domes where whilom kings did make repair,
But now the wild-flowers round them only breathe,
Yet ruined splendour still is lingering there.”

Of Alcobaça in its early splendour a Portuguese writer says, “its cloisters are cities, its sacristy a church, and its church a basilica.” During the ravages of the Peninsula war the monasteries were deserted, and among the monks, scattered up and down the country, some, owing to these adverse circumstances, and to the frailty of human nature, fell, and a few more spent a life of ease, at home with their families, or in the frivolities of the world. The larger number, however, followed the strict observances of their rule, and, at the conclusion of the peace, returned to their monasteries. But there was to be no peace for their unhappy country. The protectors, as well as the invaders of Portugal, propagated in its army liberal and revolutionary ideas. A turbulent spirit soon pervaded its ranks, and in the hands of designing men it became a powerful instrument of evil. Revolution followed revolution. Don Miguel, supported by the bulk of the nobles and by the peasantry, was, after some strange and sad mistakes in his government, and in spite of many a gallant and stubborn effort, finally overthrown, and Don Pedro, the representative of the revolution, was, by the aid of English bayonets, and by the force of foreign alliances, placed on his throne.

Many a story is told, even to this day, of the gallant exploits of the guerrilla chieftains. At their call the peasantry would at once rise in arms, for the cause of Don Miguel was identified with the cause of the Church, and the rural population of Portugal was never known to be slack in its defence. One of the most celebrated of these chieftains in the Peninsula was "the Trappist," who in the habit of his order, bareheaded and unarmed, with the cross only in his hand, led his followers almost on to certain victory. To enthusiasm he united consummate skill and daring. He inflamed the zeal of the bold by his presence, the more sluggish he roused to action by the fire of his words, and by the fervour of his prayers he inspired all under his command. The wild mountain scenery and the dark waving forest added an influence of its own, which could not fail to affect, at such a time, an enthusiastic and adventurous people. But vain were these prayers and wasted was this gallantry, in so far at least as the cause of Don Miguel was concerned. The liberal government was installed in Lisbon. It made the most of its opportunities. It lost no time in the work of reform. Reform of ecclesiastical abuses means, in the mouth of liberalism, the pillage of the Church and the overthrow of its liberties—not the pruning-knife but the axe is the tool this party makes use of.

History repeats itself. The world, with pertinacious grasp, ever strives, under one pretext or another, to lay hold of the rich monastic lands. Its heart covets its neighbour's goods and chattels. Now it is a Henry VIII. who turns reformer, and pillages the monasteries to satisfy his extravagant wants, or the better to indulge in his vicious propensities, or to enable himself with a fuller purse to bribe his corrupt nobility to forsake their religion and to enlarge the wasted domains of their inheritance. Now it is the principle of communism which, inaugurated by the French Revolution, spared with its blood-stained axe neither young nor old. None was too holy by reason of his vocation, none too fragile by weakness of sex, to escape the rage of its avarice or to allay its thirst for blood. Finding something akin to itself in the dark recesses of the human heart, it spread like a plague from land to land, more deadly in its passage than a flight of locusts, leaving a trail of corruption behind, which the

prayers of saints or the blood of martyrs alone can wash out.

The traditionary policy of the Revolution was carried out to the full at Lisbon, as well in the concealment of its motives as in the covetousness of its desires. It was enacted that all the monasteries in the country should be suppressed and their revenues forfeited to the state. The reasons alleged for this violent measure of wholesale confiscation were, that the institution of monasticism promoted idleness, that it withdrew many subjects of the realm from works of industry, or from the pursuits of commerce, or from the labours of agriculture, and that, moreover, it checked the increase of population. The monks were likewise charged with entertaining and fomenting retrograde notions among the people, and with being hostile to liberty itself. Such were the ostensible grounds on which the government proceeded to act. They abolished no fewer than four hundred monasteries, besides lay confraternities and religious foundations, and seizing the revenues and possessions of these communities, devoted as they were to works of active charity or to pious contemplation, drove with extreme and sudden harshness their revered inmates, of every age, into houseless destitution. Who so blind as not to discover the real mainspring of such outrageous conduct? It is palpable to the most dim-sighted of mortals, to the most prejudiced of men. The government was in great financial straits. It had need to replenish its exchequer from sources other than its own. The wealth of the monasteries, though not perhaps one-fifth of its reputed value, yet offered to men needy as they were avaricious, a tempting bait. Unscrupulous in the execution, as they were fertile in the conception of evil, there was no tongue to charm the heart of the destroyer, and no arm strong enough to stay the progress of devastation. Of all the magnificent monasteries, with their hereditary domains and glorious churches, some like that of Batalha, unrivalled in their gothic grandeur, of all the smaller convents on the desolate country-side, or in the remote mountainous regions, not one now remains, not one has survived the universal wreck. In Lisbon the English Dominicans alone, placing themselves under the protection of the British ambassador, resisted the royal commission; but their house also has fallen into decay. There is now no oasis in the desert, no green spot in the

monastic waste. Another mournful episode in these most tragic times was the suppression and banishment of the small colony of Jesuits, who had but just, for the first time since the original abolition of their order, returned to Portugal. It had cost many an anxious prayer, and many a stubborn effort on the part of their zealous friends, to wring from a weak and reluctant government permission for their return. At last the minister, the Duke of Cadaval,* yielded, partly to persuasion, partly to the awakened dictates of his own conscience.

No sooner was the petition for their re-establishment accorded, than communications were opened with the superior of the Jesuits in the Rue de la Sevrés, at Paris. Without loss of time four or five of the faithful and indefatigable followers of St. Ignatius went rejoicing on their way to the scene of their former triumphs and sufferings. They were received at Lisbon in their own original college, then in possession of Augustinian monks, the very place indeed from whence the great St. Xavier sailed to the Indies on his mighty work of bringing salvation to the heathen. Late in the summer of 1829, the year of our own emancipation, the sons of St. Ignatius landed in Portugal, and in the year following, they had established schools, were holding missions, hearing confessions, and already preaching in the Portuguese tongue. Their influence soon spread, they were welcomed back as old friends by the people. They became the umpires in every dispute, the peacemakers in every quarrel. They were to have taken possession again of their old convent and college at Coimbra.†

* The Duke of Cadaval was the direct descendant of the Great Constable Don Nuno Alvares Pereira, who by his talents, both as statesman and general, was chiefly instrumental in placing King John the First on the throne, in 1385. He retired to end his life in a Carmelite convent, where he died a simple lay brother.

† Here was the venerated shrine called *Nostra Senhora del Lapa*. A celebrated image of our Lady, supposed to have been hidden in the mountains at the time of the Moorish invasion, had been discovered by some shepherds in the deep cleft of a huge overhanging rock, which, narrow at the entrance, widened as you advanced, and formed a kind of natural grotto. This recess, where the image was found, was converted into a small chapel, and an altar erected, upon which one of the Jesuit fathers from the adjacent college

The Jesuits, however, were not destined to reach this favourite spot, and begin again on their accustomed ground, their ancient work and glorious labours. They, too, were overwhelmed in the universal wreck that befel all that was venerable, all that was ancient, all that was holiest in the country. They left again, their work unfinished, to await in patience the return of happier days. This hope of happier days to come is the vain delusion that still pursues us in every age and in all conditions of life. But years have rolled on, the imperceptible march of time has left this land of ancient faith and fervour in a state of religious desolation, from which, to the human eye, no escape appears possible. Hope itself is wearied with expectancy. The ribald Portuguese journals are not slow to taunt the Church with her fallen condition. They hesitate not to brand the once fair name of priest with an epithet which, alas! to-day is but too often well deserved. But are these liberal writers and their wretched abettors in high places not aware that they themselves are the guilty causes of a profane episcopate, a desecrated priesthood, and a corrupt people? Their poisoned words, like arrows flying abroad in the dark, have pierced the heart of the body politic. The wound spreads and festers until we behold a corruption as of death. But there were also other and foreign causes at work, which were accessory in bringing about this national and religious degradation.

Besides its natural hankering after the revenues of the Church, and its desire to avenge itself on the monastic orders, for keeping alive in the country the principles of loyalty and religion, the revolutionary government had no funds to meet its debts contracted abroad, and this deficiency quickened its desire and whetted its appetite to rob the patrimony of St. Peter in order to pay the loans of its foreign friends, the Jews, stock-jobbers, and money-lenders of Paris and London. These loans, which Portugal during the revolutionary wars had raised in foreign

offered the holy sacrifice on the appointed festival days. This mountainous shrine was a favourite place of pilgrimage; the huge granite blocks which formed the narrow entrance into this cave, were gradually worn smooth and rounded off by the continual passage of devout pilgrims.

countries, amounted to about two millions of our money. The all-powerful and pernicious assistance offered by those who were interested in the repayment of these vast sums, was one of the chief extraneous causes which led to the success of the revolutionary party in the ill-fated Peninsula. Tempted by a very high rate of interest, and in the hope of making a large profit out of the necessities of that sorely afflicted country, the loans were chiefly taken up in London. "This circumstance," Alison remarks, in his history of Europe, "deserves to be especially noted, as the commencement of numberless disasters both to the Peninsula and this country. It gave a large and influential body of foreign creditors an interest in upholding the revolutionary government in the Peninsula, because no other one would recognize the loans it had contracted. Their influence was soon felt in the public press both of France and England, which, with a few exceptions, constantly supported the cause of revolution in Spain and Portugal; and to this circumstance more than any other the long and bloody civil wars which distracted both nations, and the entire ignorance which pervaded this country as to their real situation, are to be ascribed." (Alison, vol. i. chap. xi.).

Between 1820-50, the immense, the almost incredible sum of £150,000,000, as stated by Lord Palmerston in his place in Parliament, was squandered by the rich capitalists of Great Britain, on the revolutionary governments of the Peninsula, and in support of their revolted colonies, in South America. The payment even of the interest on these vast loans was considered to depend on the permanent success of the Revolution; it is not, therefore, difficult to perceive out of what motive the sympathy and influence of the moneyed class were engaged on behalf of the Revolutionary party. In whatever light we look upon the abolition of the monasteries in the ill-fated Peninsula, so long torn and desolated by the conflicting passions of rival claimants to the throne, so long a prey to the wild license of the Revolution, it cannot but be regarded, whether by the sterner calculations of the political economist, or by the milder eye of the philanthropic reformer, as an unmitigated calamity. Religion alone, with her supernatural motives, and with her deeper penetration, knows how to console herself at this terrible triumph of the world over her chosen children. She trembles at

riches. She ever fears their corrupting influence. The weight of gold lies like a burden on her heart. In her eyes poverty is a charm that wins, and suffering a power that conquers. She indeed loves the way of the cross, and its termination. But, to the philanthropist and to the politician, the suppression of the monasteries was, as we have before said, an unavailing calamity, counterbalanced by no gain, mitigated by no possible benefit. For who knew so well as these holy dwellers in the solitude of the cloister, how at the call of duty or at the cry of distress, to come out of their sanctuaries to dry the tear and bind up the heart, or to bury the dead when death had made for himself a greater harvest than is his wont? Thus it was the monks and nuns, who were the saviours of the people in the fearful visitation of 1830, when one-fourth of the inhabitants of a large seaport town perished of cholera, and when out of a population of twelve thousand at another city, no fewer than six thousand souls were swept away. At Lisbon itself, thirty thousand persons fell beneath the gripe of this dread disease. None indeed know better than the inhabitants of these luxurious regions how they are exposed to more than the ordinary ills that flesh is heir to. They have felt the earth heave, and seen it engulf in opened horror its uncounted victims, buried until the Great Judgment Day, in dark and nameless oblivion. When ruin and death are scattered around, when the plague of sickness presses upon the land, and dries up in its sources the springs of life, when the blight falls on the luxurious vine, or when the harvest fails in the blackened cornfield, who, we reiterate the question, so ready, and who so able, with soothing tongue and helping hand, to bring food to the hungry, and inspire the sad with sentiments of resignation? But where are they now? Dare we ask what became of these servants of God, these angels of mercy, these helpers of men in their need? How fared it with them when the hordes of the Revolution, like swarms of locusts, swept over the land? "The cruelties exercised on the unhappy monks upon this occasion," says an English traveller, the Earl of Carnarvon, who was himself an eye-witness to the Revolution of '34, "are horrible to think of." Oh the generosity of man is beyond compare! To what can we liken it if not to his gratitude, since he returns evil for good, and crucifies them that love him. Shall we relate, but the heart sickens over the detail,

how one by one, outcasts in the land, these holy monks lay hid in the fastnesses of the lonely mountain, where the wolf kept watch, and the carrion bird drooped on its wing, until the slow death of starvation came like a friend to set them free from their anguish? None in the country parts dare come to their rescue, and those in the great cities, whom they had fed, turned against them. The dispensers of plenty died of starvation. But slow, after all, is the work of starvation. The sword is keener and swifter in its business. From want of use the sword of liberalism never blunted its edge. Who shall reckon the number, not only of priests and monks, but of peasants and nobles, partisans of religion and order, who perished under the murderous wrath of the Revolution? By the spoliation, then, of the monasteries, the rich grew richer, but the poor, to the sorrow of the true philanthropist, soon felt the sting of poverty grow sharp as death, and remembered in their misery, and remember to this day, that they have none now to help them. But the consolations of religion, and the considerations of charity, in as far as they do not affect the material welfare of the state, enter not into the calculations of the political economist. How, then, is he afflicted by the abolition of the monasteries? Is he not, one would ask, a gainer by the nefarious spoliation of the rich abbey-lands, and religious foundations, which were at once the glory of Portugal and the patrimony of the poor? Is not the public exchequer enriched by this wholesale plunder? The history of these transactions, commonly, on a closer examination, dispels the pleasant illusion. There is such a thing as division of labour; the spoils must be shared. Peculation, so flagrant in the Government, produces gross dishonesty in its underlings. Among thieves no long reckonings are made. The confiscated, Church property in Spain, for instance, which Alison computes at no less a sum than eighty millions sterling, was so squandered and wasted by the dishonest and incapable men, into whose hands it fell, that, though it may have afforded momentary relief to the Government, yet conferred no permanent benefit on the exchequer. It enriched not the State, but made the Church poor indeed. Alison, in his computation of the value of Church property confiscated, appears not to be aware that the amount it realized under the hammer was not real, but nominal. The method pursued by the Revolutionary Governments in the Penin-

sula, in the sale of Church property, was singular, and well calculated to mislead the public of Europe as to its real value. When the Government of '34 was forced by foreign alliances, and by force of arms, upon the people of Portugal, a proclamation was issued, summoning all those who had suffered by reason of their loyalty to Don Pedro and the Revolution, to prepare a list of their losses, and they would receive indemnification in full. One can more easily imagine than describe how, under such a state of things, claims upon the bountiful government multiplied. Every tenth man you met in the crowded city fancied or feigned he had suffered a grievance in purse or person for loyalty-sake, on which account, in pursuance of the imperial proclamation; he now sought redress or compensation. The bankrupt, or fraudulent trader, instead of skulking in the purlieus of the city, as heretofore, was a man in great request, for, under proper management, his losses too might be set down, not to reckless extravagance, or to profligate speculation, but to the too enthusiastic zeal he had displayed in behalf of the common weal. Petty tradesfolk who, in the whole course of their business were never worth a hundred pounds sterling, presented indemnification claims for twice that amount. Such palpable frauds were connived at by the committee sitting at Lisbon, which, composed of the extreme partizans of the newly established government, admitted without hesitation all claims presented and without examination signed certificates for payment. These indemnity bonds, so easily obtained, were readily parted with. Jews and sharpers bought them up freely at one-fifth of their supposititious value. But as compensation for these national losses, the estates of the royalists, the possessions of the monks, and the ancient property of the Church were forthwith declared to be forfeited, and brought to sale. The fortunate, if not very honest holders of these bonds, whose recognized price in the public money market was about one-third less than its nominal value, came forward to buy, as it was called; (or may we not rather say,) to take their share in the remaining spoils of the confiscated property of the church and of the loyal nobility. The proceeds of the sale computed, not on the real but on the nominal value of these indemnity bonds, were published and proclaimed on the house-tops in the hope that the apparently large possessions of the Church would serve in the eyes of the Liberals of Europe

as a justification to the government for its confiscating propensities. It did not indeed reckon without its host. The principle on which these Imperial communists acted namely, that the government was poor and the Church rich and therefore to be sacked, found approval, as many of our readers will doubtless remember, in the English press. Day by day the *Morning Chronicle* came out with long lists detailing the amount, not in the depreciated bonds, but in pounds, shillings, and pence realized by these nefarious sales, and exulting in the true liberal spirit in the appropriation of such wealth to other uses. Thus were the rural and agricultural districts of Portugal impoverished beyond recovery, the landed and royalist gentry for the most part ruined, and the monastic houses abolished to slake the vengeance of an usurping king and to requite the revolutionary rabble of the cities. This wholesale plunder fell not far short of a legalized communism. Let the countrymen of Cavour have a heed of their purses and look after their title-deeds; for when once the thievish finger of a government has, as we have seen, an itch for Church property, its heart will soon hanker after and its arm not long halt from the accomplishment of its communistic desires. But after all, the political economist might perhaps regard the spoliation of Church property, only as a negative evil, were it not that in his own special province the common weal suffered detriment from the destruction of the monasteries. For who knows better than he how the well-being of a country depends, in the main, on the state of its agriculture and on the prosperity of its rural population? From the healthy and vigorous ranks of the peasantry its cities are replenished and its armies recruited, the mill and the factory are by them supplied with fresh labour, and the needs of trade met and its calls best promoted. Not the poet only with his fine and far-reaching imagination, and the moralist in his grave wisdom are lavish in their praise of rural life; but the sober political economist joins them, if not in their love for its delights and advantages, yet in the more prosaic admiration of its productive and financial resources. By its natural promoters, however, the agriculture of this fine country was neglected, the gentry had long ceased to reside in the provinces, and it was chiefly on the estates belonging to the monasteries that husbandry flourished. From being the almost only resident

proprieters the monks supplied the place of the gentry, their beneficial influence extended over the surrounding population and was productive of many social and moral blessings. They were the best of landlords, they built and repaired bridges, opened canals, and laid down new roads and reclaimed waste land. Travellers must have often noticed in the Peninsula how monasteries situated in barren and deserted districts, had yet converted their lands by active intelligence and by the employment of their large capital into fertile and highly cultivated plains, while the neighbouring estates remained in a state of neglect or decay. Under their practical administration the morass and the moor and the bare rock had been won from their barrenness and made to yield a profit to the revenues of the monastery and to be a source of wealth to the country. They had an eye for the beautiful as well as for the useful. The abbey-lands were often adorned with the most superb timber, a welcome shelter for man and beast against the fierce noontide splendour of an almost African sun. In their grounds, at least in the midland districts, flourished the celebrated cypress of Portugal imported from its East Indian possessions. It is still the delight of travellers, who recognize in it a near approach to the beauty of the cedar of Lebanon, to which it bears a close resemblance. The rich cluster of olive trees was never wanting, which, together with the light coloured cedar and the low bending and fantastic cork tree, made up a scene of beauty which the eye wandered over with an unceasing delight. Under the able guidance of these indefatigable monks cultivation had encroached even upon the interminable wastes of Alentéjo. Nothing was too barren for their fertilizing hands, nothing too rude or abandoned for their energetic operations. They were not only good cultivators of the soil but excellent landlords. Under their mild and paternal rule the tenants prospered and enjoyed the fruits of their labour. They were not oppressed by rack-rents, as the peasantry of Ireland now are under their absentee landlords. *They* were not evicted wholesale from their holdings; their roofs were not levelled nor their cottages gutted in obedience to a vile system of land-tenure as in Ireland; for the peasantry of Portugal held their leases not indeed under enlightened Protestant landlords, but under forsooth the benighted and superstitious monks.

The celebrated author of *Vathek* alludes to the prosperous conditions of the tenants holding under the monks at the time of his visit to the magnificent convent of Alcobaça, and thirty years after, the Earl of Carnarvon, on his visit to the same spot, asserted with confidence "that their real prosperity had not diminished, although the most unceasing efforts were being made to prejudice them against their ecclesiastical superiors." "The peasantry comfortably clad in substantial garments, looked kindly and unenviably at our splendid caravan," says the entertaining author of the *Recollections of a visit to Alcobaça*, "because their hearts were expanded by good treatment, their granaries amply stored, their flocks numerous and healthy, and their landlords, the rich monks of Alcobaça, neither griping nor tyrannical. When the Prior of Aviz (with whom the author was travelling) stopped to converse with these good people, which he frequently did, and enquired with his usual affable benignity, Who taught you to till your land so neatly? to manure it with so much judgment? to raise such crops of grain? to spare your cattle all forced oppressive labour? to treat their young with so much gentleness? The answer was prompt and uniform—Our indulgent masters and kind friends, the monks of the royal monastery." But the monasteries were even in a more direct manner beneficial to the state in the heavy and exceptional amount of taxes they yielded to the exchequer. The land tax in Portugal amounted to 10 per cent, but it was never levied to anything like the full amount on lay property; only on the lands belonging to the Church was it enforced with the utmost strictness. The returns of income made by the monks formed one of the best items in the revenue of the state. What corporation in England, we should like to know, in times of national distress or difficulty, would make large and important contributions of money to the purposes of the state, as was not unfrequently done by the maligned monasteries of the Peninsula. What revenue does the state now draw from the holders of confiscated abbey-lands? Does it equal by two-thirds the amount received in former times? Even in a pecuniary point of view, how great a loser is the state. If we take, for instance, the working of the ancient convent of Santa Cruz at Coimbra as an illustration of our position of the triple advantages in religion, in individual happiness, and public revenue, accruing to

the state in the existence, and the trifling and perishable gain in the suppression of monasteries, we shall find, and candid men of whatever party will be compelled to confess, that their abolition was as much a folly as it was a crime. Santa Cruz, the chief convent and capitular house of the canons regular of St. Augustine, was founded at the close of the twelfth century by Alphonso Henriquez, the first King of Portugal, who was buried inside the chancel, where also lies his son, Sancho the First, the second king. Two extensive estates attached to this celebrated monastery, afforded it the pecuniary means of exhibiting in itself the triple advantages we have just made use of as an economic argument against the abolition of convents. By introducing an improved method of husbandry, and by inuring their tenants to its use, they promoted the agriculture of the country. Wiser in their understanding of the social questions, and of the treatment of the poor, than the philanthropic statesman, who presides at a charitable dinner, or who, after partaking of the beverage which cheers, but inebriates not, delivers himself of an elegant effusion on the subject, they ever flung open their hospitable halls to those who hungered and were athirst. They thus came in daily contact with the outcasts of the city, with the "Arabs" of society. With what result need we ask? Out of the depths of degradation they lifted up the fallen. The yawning gulf which divides society, now in suspicious fear, now in mutual hate, was bridged over by their active charity. And lastly their enlightened faith and exalted piety answered the higher and holier requirements of religion.

The extensive conventual buildings contained a dispensary, where a member of the order, not unlearned in pharmacy, prescribed drugs for the ailing poor, or received those who were too ill to remain at home into the sick ward set apart for them in the monastery. Besides the choice and well-stocked botanical garden for the use of the students of the adjacent University, there were delightful and retired walks and lawns for the convalescent poor of the city. Many of the monks, men of distinguished attainments filled chairs in the university, and conferred by their talents as much benefit on science as they did on religion. Out of the funds of their estate they partly contributed to the maintenance of a number of poor students of Coimbra, a city celebrated for

the love of learning and natural talents of its inhabitants. Many a poor but promising young man was known to have parted with a moiety of his daily allowance of food for the sake of purchasing books, and advancing his studies at the University.

The rich and valuable library of Santa Cruz, superior in selection and in antiquity to that of the University, was thrown open for the benefit of the students. Frequent and friendly intercourse for the purposes of study and religion, was maintained between the members of the University and the various monasteries situated in the lower city, or crowning the hills which surrounded and almost concealed solitary and forlorn Coimbra. In order to preserve the undisturbed privacy of its students, in their passage to and from the different lecture-halls, the ecclesiastical seminary was connected by a handsome covered aqueduct, with the Mariannos, the Benedictines, and Santa Cruz. The latter monastery, among other privileges, had the right of appointing its abbot Chancellor of the University. To his high and important office belonged the duty of prescribing the course of studies, and of presiding at the examinations. Those who went up for honours, either in theology or in civil law, had to undergo no slight ordeal. The Chancellor had also the right of conferring the degree of doctor in all the different faculties. From candidates for a degree in theology a residence of five years in the University, or in the convent to which they were attached, was required. The department devoted to science was magnificently supplied with a perfect apparatus of scientific instruments, almost equal, it is said, to that found at Paris; it boasts, also, of possessing the largest magnet known in Europe.* The Professorships of Coimbra are well endowed, and the professorial chair is considered a sure stepping-stone to stations of dignity and emolument in ecclesiastical or civil departments.

In their ancient church, built in the purest style of early Gothic, public worship was solemnized by the monks of Santa Cruz, on a scale of splendour and magnificence that left an impression of reverence on the mind, which the hand of time alone could never efface. This reverence, however, was too soon destined to be rooted out by the

* Rev. W. M. Kinsey.

ribald insolence of revolutionary passion. The name and fame of Santa Cruz stayed not for an instant the on-sweep of the Revolution, saved not a stock nor a stone of its vast possessions. It perished with all its various and valuable institutions. Its social charities, its learning, its ancient and holy origin inspired no reverence, awoke no remorse in the heart of the hateful leveller. All the loving bonds that knit this community to the hearts of the people were rent asunder by a hand that seemed in its violence to own a preternatural force. All belonging to this monastery that has not perished has passed into other hands. Its church is desecrated, a part of the pile of buildings has fallen into decay, a part has been converted into a factory, the rest turned into government storehouses. The grand botanical garden has become a flower-show for the gay and ungrateful citizens of Coimbra. The library has fallen into the hands of the University. All save the poor have had their share in the spoils. One of the vast estates fell into the hands of a Portuguese money-lender, in London. Thus miserably passed away and perished from the face of the earth, one of the most ancient foundations of piety in the land—a site of historic renown—the burial-place of kings—the sanctuary of saints—the earthly home and last resting-place of their bodies, predestined to a glorious transfiguration. Gone, even from the memories of forgetful men, are those who in life were the friends of God, the fathers of the people, the reconcilers of humanity to its fate, the practical preachers of resignation, the binders up of the frustrated hope and of the broken heart. “The suppressors,” says the author of ‘*Vathek*,’ “of institutions which tend to soothe those lacerating woes humanity is subject to, and to absorb in the glorious prospect of the future, the corroding misery of the present, are, in fact, suppressors of happiness; the delegates of that dread, invisible agency, which, under an endless variety of specious masks, is ever in movement, seeking whom and what it may devour.”

How unfavourable must the present ecclesiastical state of the nation be, since it suffers in comparison, as well with the miserable period of Pombal, as with the disastrous condition of affairs which prevailed during the Peninsular War, and the subsequent revolutionary turmoils of 1820. Before the revolution of Don Pedro, before the reign of his inglorious daughter, Donna Maria da Gloria,

and of Coburg, the debauched King Regent, some bishops indeed were tainted with the noxious principles of Ultragallicanism and Febronianism, some priests were luxurious if not dissolute in manners, and some of the religious orders relaxed in discipline. If scandals not a few occurred among the mendicant friars, before the visitation of convents, instituted in the time of Don Miguel; yet the relaxed cords of discipline were, after that inquiry, soon tightened, and the abuses prevalent in some religious houses redressed, and those members, who were a disgrace to the habit they wore, relegated at once to convents of stricter discipline or of severer rule. Perhaps an earlier, more energetic, and more decisive course of action on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities, might have put a prompter stay on the evil, and obviated public scandal. True it was, and it operated as one of the chief causes of the abuses that prevailed, that the number of the religious houses was too large in proportion to the number of their inmates. The fewer the monks the laxer the discipline of the monastery. Six thousand monks or more, were, at the time of their dissolution, dispersed through no fewer than four hundred houses. Thus, in some convents, by reason of the fewness of their numbers, community life became difficult or impossible.

Not to disperse the monks, but to reduce the number of smaller monasteries, had been the better policy. But they were adjudged by no impartial judgment, they were stricken down by no friendly hand. How, then, does it stand with the country, since the abolition of the monasteries, and the triumph of the Revolution? Have abuses abated? Is laxity of living diminished? Is immorality on the decline? Has godliness been promoted in the Church, sound principles in the State? Has not rather every ecclesiastical office, from the highest to the lowest, been filled with mere creatures of the Government? Have not men been elevated to high clerical stations, not because of their known piety, not on account of purity of manners, not even by reason of their theological attainments, but solely because they enjoyed the favour of a corrupt court, or the grace of a masonic lodge? Nay, even more, men have been raised to the episcopate, because it was hoped such appointments would bring scandal, on the Church of God. Not so long ago, a man addicted to gambling, accused of immorality, was nomina

the Government of Portugal to a high station in the Church. By means of an overturning Providence, he frustrated their wicked hopes, blasted their evil purposes in a manner so sudden almost as that of St. Augustine. But what shall we say of the notorious Padre Marcos who lived a few years later in the Belem, and even there, by all accounts, the slightest regard for their good name, a modest and unobtrusive manner, the good companion who, later on in life, was so contemptuous of his wife, outraged public decency, and in the company of revolutionary refugees, brought disgrace to the priestly character? This gambler, this evil-doer, spoiled and stupid, was the same who, under the name of Lacedemonia, in parades of the Patriarchate of Lisbon, set religious decency like a banner, by parading about under the public eye his bastard children and their shameless mothers with an insulting effrontery. There was no reverence, no awe, though it was mixed, no shame in his eye, and he knew, though it held a crazier, knew no restraint. What can be said in extenuation of another Vicar-General in the diocese of Lamego, who, vested with episcopal powers, absolved from their vows of inclosure a community of nuns, because, staying at their convent, on his way to a shrine of celebrity in the neighbourhood, and finding the time hang heavily on his hands, he desired for his own entertainment, and for that of his numerous retinue, lay and clerical, the introduction of secular music and the pleasure of the dance? Pushing his audacity still further, he quartered, in violation of all propriety, and of the rule of inclosure, his followers on the convent, because the neighbouring hostelry had not sufficient accommodation forsooth for so goodly a company. The bad example set by too many of their superiors, was followed only too often by the parochial clergy. Eager in the pursuit of wealth, they lost all relish for the cure of souls. They lusted after the rich benefices, which the Government was only too glad to bestow on the servile, or on the corrupt. To the ruler that meditates evil, an incorruptible priesthood is a perpetual difficulty. To bribe the priesthood was henceforth the policy of Government, it had faith in the power of gold over the hearts of men, its hope was to bring about a rupture with Rome. It was not mistaken in its belief, nor disappointed in its hope, nor frustrated in its work. The priesthood of Portugal fell before the tempter. To pro-

pitiate the favour of the Government, they too often displayed in the press and in the lecture-hall, a senseless hostility against the Holy See. When darkness lowered over the land, they were no shining lights. When the storm broke over the city, the watchers, it was found, had forsaken the watchtower. In possession of the wealth they coveted, the more vicious among them feared not to live in open profligacy. They lost all hold on the people. The peasantry will travel many a mile in search of a priest of the old times, or of one of those proscribed monks, who are still the mainstay of religion, to make their shrift. They are known often to have refused to go to church under the idea that the mass of a profane priest was of no avail. To such priests as these, who are active only in the pursuit of wealth, zealous alone in self-aggrandisement, the lines of the author of "the Hind and the Panther," will fitly apply. Unmindful of their Divine Master's example, they forgot that

"The crown He wore was of the pointed thorn;
In purple He was crucified, not born;
They who contend for place or high degree
Are not His sons, but those of Zebedee."

The hope of religious regeneration depends less on priest or bishop than on the people.* The peasantry are still sound, and cling with a tenacious hold to their ancient faith, and follow its holy precepts with a zeal which edifies while it surprises. We have staunch Protestant testimony to vouch for the unalterable attachment of the Portuguese people to their religion, although we owe an apology to our readers for introducing to them a reverend writer who does not hesitate to speak in mendacious terms of the bloody thralldom of the Jesuits and the tyranny of a bigoted

* Moehler observed that had clerical celibacy not existed in Catholic Germany, the moral renovation of its clergy, which has occurred in our times, would not have taken place. The son of a priest would, as in Russia, have probably followed the example of his father. But as the clergy sprang out of the peasantry which had preserved the purity of faith and morals, the chances of priestly regeneration were thus infinitely greater than they would have been under the other system.—Vide Miscellaneous Essays, Art., Sacerdotal Celibacy.

priesthood. "In any attempt," says this English clergyman, "to introduce the purer system," of Protestantism, forsooth, "it will be necessary, we repeat, that the utmost possible discretion and tenderness should be shown towards the prevailing prejudices, and that they should be touched by a very gentle hand, for the attachment borne to the system established is still inveterate among the great body of the people. The wisest and most prudent legislator might fail in the undertaking; but it is to be hoped whenever the Cortes shall prescribe a change in the national forms of religion, that it will enforce its decrees in the first instance upon the parochial clergy."* For the reform of the middle classes there is not much ground for hope. The system of education in the preparatory schools is, for the most part, unsound. Since the suppression of Evora, which fell with the Jesuits, Coimbra is the only university; but though it owes its origin to good King Denis, the patriot king, it is animated and guided by the principles of Pombal, who is still the evil genius of the place. The text-books† in common use are Protestant works, and the professors, outstepping the bounds of their text, enforce Jansenistical principles on their hearers, and are ever foremost, in treating of Church history, to take part against the Papacy. History is poisoned in its source, and the streams of truth are polluted before they reach the parched lips of the student. No enlightened works, on sound Catholic principles, issue from the press. Beyond the ordinary manuals, no works of devotion, or of asceticism, are to be found. A search for this purpose has been made and was utterly fruitless. Beneath the wither-

* The pages of this writer, the Rev. W. M. Kinsey, are disfigured by displays of partisanship and prejudice against monasticism and the priesthood, which yield only when he is brought into personal contact with them, and then he feels bound to speak of monks and priests in fair and honourable terms. The work in a material point of view is embellished, however, by some spirited drawings of the various costumes worn by the different monastic orders, and of the peculiar dress of the country-people, executed in 1828, in his accustomed graphic and effective style, by the able hand of the late Mr. Pugin.

† Gmeiner—*Jus Publicum Ecclesiasticum*, (Elements of.)
 Dane Meyer—*History of Ecclesiastical Law*.
 Cavallarius—*Elementa Juris Canonici*.

ing influence that has so long blighted the intellect and dried up the heart of the nation, literature itself in every branch has perished. One work only of note has of late appeared. It is an able and remarkable history of Portugal, but conceived in a spirit of ill-will against the Church, and filled with hostile sentiments against the Holy See. The author, Alexandre Herculano, is one of that not small party which is accused of doing its best to favour, at the present juncture, Protestant proselytism in Portugal. No man of genius appears to rally around him the scattered forces of the Catholic and royalist party. No bold front is shown in the Cortes, no eloquent lips are heard in defence of religion and of ancient right, or in unflinching defiance of an ever-aggressive, false, and impious Liberalism. In other parliaments besides that of England disunion prevails among the defenders of right, or a false timidity, or motives still less honourable. The pulpit is as deserted as the tribune. Though preaching is a divine ordinance, the voice of the preacher has lost its utterance. An ominous silence broods over a land in many respects still so Catholic, a dead stillness like that which precedes the outbreak of the storm. One voice, indeed, was heard, but for too brief a time, the voice of a poet, brilliant, effective, and satirical, of a philosophical thinker, and of a preacher who appealed at once to the heart and to the understanding of his hearers. Though his hand is no longer traced in the brilliant page of the Catholic journals,* though his writings are scattered like the Sybilline leaves, and though death has come, an early but perhaps not unwelcome visitor, and, as is not unfrequently the case, claimed its victim just as he was rising into fame, yet the memory of the once calceated Augustinian friar, Padre José de Marcedo, will long linger in the heart of his suffering country. In his attempts to reform the discipline and morals of his clergy, the late most excellent Patriarch of Lisbon long felt the need of such a zealous priest. Single-handed this prelate could effect but little. The clergy

* The Catholic and royalist journals, the *Nação*, the *Peuple*, and the *Droit*, written with singular ability, have as respectable a circulation (which it is important to note) as the bad liberal papers enjoy. None of the latter, however, indulge in the impious licence permitted in Paris to the *Siècle* under the rule of Napoleon, who appears to respect more the rights of his dynasty than those of religion.

resisted his reforms and set his authority at naught. The liberal press was but too glad to mix itself up in the unseemly quarrel, and to encourage these unworthy priests in their scandalous disobedience to episcopal authority. Who is surprised, when vice invades the sanctuary and obtrudes itself on the altar, that the good, even among the laity, hold aloof from the ministrations of the Church? The late most estimable and pious queen, whose loss, if there be any truth in a recent report, Portugal will have still greater reason to lament, shocked at the scandalous conduct of the clergy, had to seek at the Papal Nunciature, or in the English College, for a confessor. The sheep has to go in search of the shepherd. There is none to watch at the door of the fold. If the shepherd be stricken down must not the flock go astray?

The hurried mass and the careless demeanour of the celebrant are no incentive to devotion. In the English college at Lisbon only is the monotony of the vesperless Sunday broken. No benediction brings down the blessing of God, no sermon, no evening rosary break the unechoing stillness of these deserted churches. The Portuguese government is the guilty cause of this far-spreading evil, whose issue no mortal eye can foresee. In thwarting the authority of the Holy See, in elevating to the episcopate men wholly unfit for this grave and responsible charge, the government has inflicted an irreparable injury on the nation, whose good it ought to have at heart. There is a voice of wailing in the Church of Portugal, like the wailing heard at Rama, of Rachel weeping over her lost children. But the Church mourns to-day, not over her departed grandeur, not for the loss of "barbaric pearl and gold," not because the dreary wind sweeps through the long-drawn aisles of her roofless and desolate churches, not because in the once glorious choirs and corridors of her ruined monasteries, the bat and the owl, the unclean birds of night, keep watch, and fill with hideous shrieks like those of evil spirit, the vaulted domes where the midnight chaunts of the monks of old once were heard. But she mourns because the glory of her priesthood has departed, because the salt of the earth hath lost its savour, because her ancient ministers are failing her, in her hour of utmost need, and because the scattered remnant of her proscribed and treasured monks are fast dying out from the land.

The Church of Portugal can no more to-day apostrophise her priest in the eloquent words of the poet:—

“There stands the messenger of truth,—there stands
The legate of the skies ; his theme divine,
His office sacred, his credentials clear;
By him, the violated law speaks out
Its thunders, and by him in strains as sweet
As angels use, the Gospel whispers peace,
He 'stablishes the strong, restores the weak,
Reclaims the wanderer, binds the broken heart ;
And armed himself in panoply complete
Of heavenly temper, furnishes with arms
Bright as his own, and trains by every rule
Of holy discipline, to glorious war
The sacramental hosts of God's elect.”

The burden of the Church's grief is cast now upon her patriarch. It is his duty to lead on to glorious war the hosts of God. He has already girded himself up for battle. By him indeed the violated law speaks out its thunders. Against him the arch enemy of God and man, fearful of losing his ground, is lashed to fury. More than once within the year has the assassin's knife been lifted against the High Priest of Lisbon, because he prefers to follow the precepts of God rather than obey the behests of the Masonic Lodge. The priceless crown of martyrdom has been almost within his sight. Let him remember the glorious words of Tertullian, “Sanguis martyrum semen est Christianorum,” and Portugal may haply hereafter have reason to rejoice that the blood of martyrs is the seed of Christians.

ART. IV.—*A Journal kept in Turkey and Greece in the autumn of 1857 and the beginning of 1858.* By Nassau W. Senior, Esq. London: Longman and Co., 1859.

SOME years ago one of the most prominent of our leading questions was “What shall we do with our convicts?” Perhaps we were wrong to have said “leading question,” as that expression has a pretty well understood legal meaning, and implies the kind of question which an adroit counsel puts to a witness when he wishes to give him

an inkling of the kind of answer counsel would be happy to get. What we mean by "leading question" is the style of question which furnishes a good heading for a leading article. Accordingly, it was very worthy matter for a leading article when the Strand was dangerous for belated passengers, and ladies were garotted in Oxford Street before night had fallen. For a year past, or more, we have heard little of the ticket-of-leave men, although probably they can, and do, use their life-preservers with sufficient effect. The Indian Mutiny, the War in Italy, the Great Eastern, Spurgeon, Palmer, and Smethurst, to say nothing of the new Chinese war, supplied, and continue to supply material for leading articles, and in the meanwhile we have ceased to ask what shall we do with our convicts, and we allow our convicts to do very nearly what they think fit. The same thing, as nearly as may be, is taking place on the Continent of Europe as in the Commonwealth of England.

"Grove nods to grove, each alley has its brother."

If we have to solve the question, "What shall we do with our convicts," and if we neglect it, Europe has to solve the equally important question,—What shall we do with our Turks?—and Europe neglects it equally. The existence of the Turks in Europe is perhaps the most curious anomaly in Europe, if we except the Irish Church Establishment. What does it amount to? We find a territory more highly favoured by nature than perhaps any other in the world; a soil as rich as the virgin loam of America; a sun that will ripen every fruit, from the olive and water-melon to the strawberry and sloe; natural harbours that can scarcely be improved by art; and native races of the almost unmixed blood of Epaminondas, Pericles, Agesilaus, and Alexander. Let us not stop for the present to ask why; but we find that beautiful region, fitted to be the seat of empire and art, bestridden by the most obscene, and the most decrepit tyranny that exists anywhere, or that ever has existed. The Turks are more backward in civilization than were the Mexicans in the days of Cortes. The Mexican empire was traversed by roads, and had the benefit of a postal and almost a telegraphic system, not excelled by any existing in Europe at the time. Its financial condition was not unsound, and its administration not more oppressive than that of most

countries in the world. It was constantly progressive, and there is no knowing to what development and to what perfection the whole might not have been carried were it not for the coming of the Spaniards. It was the case of an empire advancing, like that of Rome, from small beginnings, gradually encroaching upon, absorbing and assimilating the neighbouring countries. Again, the Mahometan government of India, although unable to afford an effectual resistance to British encroachments, continued great, and strong, until overreached by intrigue or overcome in the field; but the most corrupt, the most retrograde, the most rapidly decaying of all the Mahometan empires, is the only one whose preservation seems to be the peculiar study and the darling care of Europe. With the exception of some African tribes, the Turks were the most stupid and incapable race that adopted the creed of Islam. The comparative civilization of the Moors, Indians, and Arabs, may be taken as a sufficient proof that the Mahometan religion, detestable though it be, is not the only cause of the miserable state of the Turkish empire. The Turks can hardly be said to be degenerate. They never could have had a footing in Europe if Europe had seriously opposed their settlement in Greece. From the moment they achieved their conquest they began to decline, and it seems likely that they will go on declining until they finally die out. We usually find great military virtues attributed to the founders of the Turkish empire, but if we study the mere facts, their military virtues will be reduced to very modest proportions. They overran the territories of the Greek empire it is true, and routed the Greek armies in many a battle; but the Greek empire was only the shadow of a name, and the Greek armies hardly more substantial. When they captured Constantinople, they took a city which had already been taken and sacked with little trouble by the Latins; and up to the period of their final settlement in Europe the Greeks were the only enemies with whom they had to deal. Unlike the Saracens, they never had to meet the shock of European chivalry, or to make head against hundreds of thousands of Crusaders. They were most frequently encountered by the smallest states in Europe, the Venetians and the Genoese, who resisted them, and conquered them, and forced them into treaties, by mercenary troops in no great numbers; and we find the entire force of their enormous

empire, while it was yet populous, and under their greatest sovereign, held at bay, and finally driven back by a few hundred Knights Hospitallers in Rhodes and Malta.

Their success at Constantinople would, however, have been too alarming to Europe not to have brought about a crusade, and the speedy extermination of the Turks, had it not been for the Reformation. The treachery of the Greeks in the first crusade, and their worse than Punic faith in all their dealings, civil and religious, with the West, had cooled the sympathies of Europe for Constantinople and its princes. There was no brotherhood between Greek and Latin, and the Latins at first saw nothing more than retribution, in the invasion and subjugation of the Eastern empire. Not so the Popes. Their instinct was truer and more prophetic; and the summons to a crusade, which they issued after the fall of Constantinople, would have been successful had it not been for the Reformation, and its political as well as its religious consequences. The instinct of the greatest of the Turks was as true in its way as that of the Popes, for Soliman II. watched with the utmost interest the movements of Luther, and pronounced him to be a great man sent by God for the destruction of Christianity. It is to the Reformation that the Turks owe their settlement in Europe; as it is quite plain that they who were baffled and defeated by five or six hundred Knights of Malta could never have withstood a crusade with Charles V. at its head, and Francis I. for his lieutenant. But for the Reformation, the battle of Lepanto would have been followed up, in the course of a few weeks, by the expulsion or extermination of the Turks; and but for the same cause the defeat of the Turks before Vienna, by John Sobieski, would have led to the like result. From the period, however, when the religious revolution had acquired real strength, union became impossible in Europe. There is nothing that politicians will not turn to account. Charles V. used Luther as a pawn, and Cardinal Richelieu did the same with Gustavus Adolphus and the Turks. Those most wretched, besotted, and imbecile of all conquerors, the common suttlers of the Mahometan camp, without any quality to command respect, or any that should have inspired serious fear, were permitted to obtain, and are permitted to hold, possession of the fairer portions of Europe, Africa, and Asia, because Europe never could

since the Reformation, and probably never can again, act as one nation, or as one family of nations.

It is plain, however, that the Turkish empire is not protected now by the same influence which prevailed two hundred years ago. The Turks were then formidable, or at least comparatively formidable. They never could have withstood a real struggle with any one great power, much less with united Europe; but they were strong enough to create a diversion, where two states, like France and Austria, were at war. And besides, they were only at a short distance of time from their original triumphs. They had not had leisure to depopulate and impoverish their empire; and as they were always ready for war and plunder, it is perhaps not surprising that they always found some one to favour them, because it was always possible to make them useful. The case, however, is widely different now. There is hardly a state in Europe which could not bully and defeat the Turks, if suffered to do so by the protecting states, for Turkey is as much under a protectorate as Greece or Belgium. If at this moment Victor Emmanuel were to prosecute his claim to the kingdoms of Cyprus and Jerusalem, who can doubt that he would make an end of the Turkish empire, more rapidly perhaps than that empire was constructed? His claim of Cyprus and Jerusalem would be quite as plausible, to say the least, as was that of our Henry V. to the crown of France. Nay, it is more than probable that Walker, and a few hundred rowdies, from Arkansas, duly equipped with bowie knives and revolvers, would annex the territory to the Free United States, with or without slavery, in the course of a few months; and out of the union of Greek and Yankee, produce decidedly the smartest nation in the universe.

There is no one, after all, who does not know why the Turkish government, if we may be permitted to abuse the name, is suffered to exist. The division of the territory is too difficult, and its possession by any one great power, would make that power preponderant. On the other hand, no great power is such an abstract of public virtue as to care anything about the oppressed nationalities of Turkey for their own sakes; and except for the influence of the money market, or as a cause of war, no Euro state would feel much concern at hearing that the Greek race had undergone the bowstring, and p

their present state they would be no sensible loss to morality or civilization.

Mr. Senior's book, although the least pretentious volume we have read upon the subject, is by no means the least instructive. It does not profess to give a single original view of the author, and is therefore very slightly tinged with his prejudices. As a careful and agreeable compiler of other men's opinions upon the resources and chances of the existing Turkish empire, he cannot fail to recommend himself to those who make a study of the question. The most impracticable opinions you meet with in the book are usually the most dogmatic in their enunciation, but as they are not the author's, he of course is not responsible for them. Many others are urged with modesty and diffidence, and often prefaced with an admission of the almost hopeless difficulty of the subject. They are supplied by men of various professions and nations, by diplomatists, physicians, lawyers, doctors, Germans, French, English, and Turks themselves. They are very different, and in many respects, as might be expected, contradictory; but they all concur in affirming that the Turkish empire is breaking up. That is so far satisfactory. Some say it is owing to the gradual expansion of the Christian races of the empire, who will burst asunder the thin layer of Turks by which they are at present straitened and kept in. Others maintain that the death of the Turkish empire will not be violent, but that, as its old possessors would have said, it will perish by the silent shafts of Apollo and Diana. It is wasting, they tell us, by a quiet and natural decay which nothing can arrest, but which may be accelerated. Others, again, will have it that the decay is not quiet, nor natural, but that Turkey is mortifying and putrid at the extremities, as well as diseased at heart. Very many attribute the increased rapidity of Turkish dissolution to the interference of foreign ambassadors, who, to this extent appear to act in concert, namely, that each one advises remedial measures to the Sultan, so long as his own influence prevails; while all the rest concur in thwarting the measures advised by any member of their body. The more sanguine say, that if the Turkish government were allowed to have its will, that is, to plunder, waste, and depopulate without restriction, it would live for hundreds of years to come, and would overmatch the Christian races as it has hitherto done; but that, as it will

not be allowed to do so, the present system will shortly make an end of it. It has no roads, no canals, no railways, and no prospect of any worth mentioning. The Sultan understands nothing but his pleasures. He does not even know how to rob with judgment. He would kill the goose with the golden eggs to get the supposed hoard, and would not balk his fancy in the building of a summer-house for a matter of four or five millions, however procured. His subordinates are only deputy robbers, and usually leave their pashaliks so bare that every succeeding governor finds them less productive, but still manages to make his fortune. Justice is sold, injustice is sold, punishment is sold, impunity is sold, monopolies are sold, privileges are sold, and everything that is not sold, the consul or the ambassador may have by bullying. Whole villages, and even cities, of Turks wear out, and the desert is every day gaining upon what had once been fields and towns. There is no aristocracy, and no middle class, there is no such thing as founding a family or a name. There is no spirit, no life, no faith, no honesty, in the administration. The Turks in office foresee the speedy dissolution of the state, but give themselves no trouble to avert it; while the Turks out of office believe they are as flourishing a people as in the days of Soliman the Magnificent, if, indeed, they carry back their minds to a period so remote.

Few, if any, of the speakers whom Mr. Senior brings forward suggest any but palliative remedies, and not one gives expression to a hope that his favourite remedy, or any other, will be applied. But, while diplomatists are checking and counterchecking each other at the Porte, no one seems to think of the measure that must be taken when the break up arrives. Least of all does any one appear to imagine that it may happen much earlier than people expect. The Italian question does not seem to be by any means so satisfactorily adjusted, that any moment may not bring on another and more determined war than that which has been closed or interrupted by the peace of Villafranca. Unless it be that France and Russia have already come to an understanding for the partition of the empire, it is hardly conceivable that Russia will not profit by the next general war to make a seizure of the whole. On the other hand it is quite impossible that a state should prosper which is subjected to the continual inter-

ference of four foreign countries, any one of which, single handed, could subjugate it in a few months; but, whatever form of government, or anarchy, or political division of territory is likely to follow the dissolution of the Turkish empire, its dissolution would seem to be an event which no European government that is well prepared, and on its guard, has an interest in promoting. The manner of the break-up will probably disappoint the speculations of the wisest, but if the Great Powers are prepared, and at peace, the issue may be more peaceful than any one supposes; for at present, who is there who does not expect a war of succession to follow the decease or flight of the last of the Sultans? What we know of the little monarchy of Greece, and particularly what we learn of it from Mr. Senior's book, is not very encouraging to those who advocate the reconstruction of the Greek empire. If King Otho's Greeks are to be a sample of the materials out of which the second "Bas Empire" is to be framed, the enterprise would seem to be about as hopeful as the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem. Greece, it seems, is just as destitute of roads, even of farm roads, as Turkey proper; its inhabitants are almost as lazy, and quite as dirty as the Turks; and if they are more thrifty than their old masters, they are even more faithless and corrupt than any Turk, or perhaps than any Asiatic. We must remember, too, how far back these corruptions date; and that the perverted ingenuity, the craft, the suppleness, the meanness, the versatility, and the falsehood of the Greeks were proverbial long before their conversion to Christianity, and were almost complete before their conquest by the Romans. The Byzantine court and government were certainly not of a character to regenerate any people, and much less a people resembling the Greeks. Even the Turkish rule, brutalising, and demoralising as it has proved, would have been more likely, *à priori*, to exercise a purifying influence over the Greeks, than was the government which had preceded it. Reformation is at least a possible result of suffering and correction; but the experience of nine hundred years had proved that nothing good could come from the Greek emperors. From the days of Philip, to the present hour, the Greek character has gone on corrupting its way and developing new vices. Whether in prosperity or in adversity, whether plundered by proconsuls, as a province; or pampered by Cæsars as

the seat of empire ; or again reduced to slavery by the most stupid and brutal of Mahometan tribes ; or again restored to some degree of independance ; Pagan, Christian, Orthodox, or Schismatic, Greece has never for a moment paused or halted in the path of moral degeneracy. Chrysostoms, and Basils, and Gregories were lost upon her, and it seemed as if nothing could arrest her decline in faith, morals, and government. It is only natural that the vices developed during her last centuries of existence should be those of slaves ; treachery, falsehood, cunning and deceit. It was over a race like this, with a little territory quite insufficient for purposes of revenue or of dignity, and with a more than semi-barbarous population, overrun by an army of brigands, and having hardly any element of strength or any materials out of which to form a civilized commonwealth that Otho of Bavaria was called to rule. The crown had previously been offered to the fortunate Prince Leopold ; in nothing more fortunate than in having very civilly declined the offer. It is told of Charles V., that when the Corsicans made a similar offer of their little island to him, and wound up their address with a gift of themselves to his imperial majesty, the reply of the Emperor was short and to the purpose. "*Messieurs vous vous donnez à ma Majesté, et ma Majesté vous donne tous au Diable.*" Prince Leopold was not the master of a good half of Europe and of a new world beyond the Atlantic, and therefore he was civil ; and no doubt assured the protecting powers of his distinguished consideration ; but he had in all probability just as little affection for the Greeks as Charles had for the Corsicans. Still a crown is seldom long in the market, and, accordingly, Otho of Bavaria accepted the crown of Greece, from which he derives a rather handsome income, and at the cost of some managment, and a good deal of corruption, contrives to exercise substantial power over his subjects, with the forms of a constitution. His parliament, however, it would seem, is a less hurtful institution than any of the continental assemblies, so called. It just serves to protect, or, as the French say, to cover the responsibility of the crown, and no more. It registers the royal decrees and votes the supplies like a dutiful parliament, as it is ; although itself and the constitution of which it forms part are the offspring of a street row in the modern Athens. It would seem plain to the least experienced student of history, that,

for a young state like that of modern Greece, just emerging from slavery, and so greatly requiring the direction of a single resolute will for the suppression of disorders and the forwarding of public works, a provisionally absolute government would be the most suitable, and the one most likely to conduce to the interests of the country. It is evident that king Otho is not deficient in tact and not without ability. He has succeeded in becoming popular among subjects who not long since disliked himself and his nation pretty strongly; and he appears to have acquired considerable skill in the management of the constitution and in the shuffling and cutting of ministries. He seems to be clever enough at cabinet work, and the details of business; but he has not used either his substantially absolute powers or his constitutional forms for the promotion of any public work, and it does not appear that Greece is traversed by a single road, or, indeed, that there is a road at all in the country, unless within a few miles of Athens.

But the strangest part of all the working of the Greek constitution is, that which is played by the robber interest, which, according to Mr. Senior's account, is a recognised political element in the practical working of the state, although there is no allusion to it in the written constitution. The robber party is spoken of with as much respect as we speak of the country party, or the Manchester party, or the Peelites. Perhaps it ought not to appear strange to us, who, after all, have had our own robber party high in parliament, and moving in the best circles outside. At bottom, perhaps, it was not a greater scandal that Sadler should be a lord of the treasury, than that a robber on furlough should be a deputy in Athens; but it certainly does look strange to find in parliament a well known bandit, whose troop is at that moment, perhaps, sacking a house a few miles distant under one of his lieutenants, and as is likely, with the full cognisance of parliament.

The one redeeming feature in the Greek character would seem to be the earnest desire of all the Hellenic race for union and political independence. Although for political reasons we were obliged to restrain the Greeks from creating a diversion in favour of Russia, by the invasion of Thessaly and Macedonia in 1854, no one can deny that the desire to recover those territories from the Turks is a most natural and justifiable one on the part of the Greeks. The Ionians have a passionate, although perhaps not a

very intelligible longing for union with their brethren on the continent; and every one who has spoken to a Greek regarding the hopes of the nation, has uniformly been answered, that those hopes point to the recovery of Constantinople and the revival of a Greek empire. This is certainly no more than natural, and the hope of the Greeks is greatly recommended by the determination which seems to accompany it. They believe that they themselves are quite able to retrieve the fortunes of Greece, if allowed to do so by the protecting powers, although it is pretty certain that the protecting powers will suffer them to do nothing of the kind, inasmuch as the same powers exercise a protectorate over Turkey also, in the well-understood interest, not of Turkey by any means, but of themselves. Still, how unfit soever the Greeks may have proved themselves for empire, and how impracticable soever the Greek empire may be, the resolution of the Greeks to emancipate their race from the loathsome rule of the Turks is a good and hopeful symptom—the only good and hopeful one in the national character.

As the political institution of highway robbery is common to both Greece and Turkey, and as in Greece equally with Turkey this particular kind of enterprise is wholly in the hands of Greeks, we have thought it would be well to give a specimen of the style in which it is carried on by men who, in due time, may come to be the constitutional advisers of a constitutional king.

“We dined with Mr. Hanson, and met Dr. McCrith, a physician, settled for some years in Smyrna. We talked of the two robber chiefs, Yani Katergee and Simos. ‘I spent a week,’ he said, ‘in company with Simos, by day and by night.’

“‘We all,’ I said, ‘heard of your capture; will you give us the details of your residence with him? How long ago was it?’

“‘Three years,’ he answered; ‘I was riding, in 1854, one summer’s afternoon, from Bouruabat to a neighbouring village, about four miles from Smyrna,’ when I was desired to stop, and found myself surrounded by armed men. They led me into a thicket, where I found nine or ten prisoners like myself. They kept us there until it was dark, then dismissed all except six, that is to say, four Smyrniotes, a Jew, and myself. They fixed the ransoms of the Smyrniotes and me, first at £3000, or £600 a piece, made me write a note stating their demand, and sent the Jew to Smyrna on my horse to bring it, having first stripped him of his fur pelisse, and given it to me to wear in the mountains, during the nights. They then walked us off across the plain to the mountains. We

halted high up in an oak wood, took a sheep and a couple of lambs from a neighbouring fold, and roasted them whole; in short, with the fine water of the mountains, I made a good supper; and Simos, who took great care of me, made me a bed of boughs of trees. The next day we lay quiet, sentinels being posted round. As soon as it was dark, finding that three of the Smyrniotes were of little value, they sent them off, and we then started, and walked rapidly towards the place, about twenty miles off, where the Jew was to meet us on the day after with the ransom. I was tired; they met an old man on a donkey, took it from him, put me on it, and made him accompany us to take care of it.

"How many," I asked, "were the robbers?"

"They were originally nine," he said, "all Greeks; but on the second day we recruited a tenth, a young Turk, whom we met flying from the conscription. He was well armed, and we complied with his request to be allowed to join us. The third night's march brought us near to the place where we were to find the Jew with the ransom; we posted our watch and lay quiet. One of them fell asleep on his post, and was severely beaten by Simos. Towards noon our sentinels reported that they could see with their telescopes about thirty Turkish soldiers climbing up the mountain. 'We shall not let them take you out of our hands,' said Simos to me; he had said the same thing to me once before. 'I wish,' I said to him, 'that you would not keep dinning that into my ears; I know what it means, and you need not always be putting me in mind of it.'

"What did it mean?" I asked.

"It meant," he answered, "that to prevent a rescue they would shoot me."

"What could they get by that?" I asked.

"It would set an example," he answered; "they could show that the only means of saving a prisoner's life was to pay his ransom: that to rescue him was impossible. The robbers," he continued, "aware that the Jew had betrayed them, took up a position on the mountain side, where the path was steep, and awaited the arrival of the soldiers, under cover of rocks and brushwood. They left my fellow-prisoner and me under the guard of two men, one of whom was the man who had been beaten. The man stood with us a little behind the brow of the hill. The other was on its top, and could look down on the field of battle. In about an hour we heard shots, and from their frequency it seemed that the action was brisk.

"Our guard had been very sulky ever since his beating. I said to him: 'You have taken to a trade which will not prosper, you are sure in a week or two, perhaps in a day or two, to be shot or beheaded. Help me to escape, and I will ensure your pardon and preferment.' He turned very red, and said, he could not break his oath to Simos. 'Nonsense,' I said, 'do you suppose that God

requires you to keep such an oath as that?' Then he said that the other man would shoot us. 'On the contrary,' I said, 'I will shoot him. He has his back towards us, lend me your gun. The instant I have shot him we will run down the hill to the soldiers below.' As I was saying this, the guard who was in advance turned, and called out to us that the soldiers were beaten, and running, throwing away their arms. So this chance of escape had failed. None of the band were hit, but I was told that several of the soldiers had fallen. Simos now said that he would take a circuit of two days, to a house where he had a friend upon whom he could rely, as bearer of the ransom and the message. We walked for about four hours over the mountain ridges, and then lay down in a thicket. Soon after a Turk on horseback rode along the track, and swerved from it, I know not with what intention, into the thicket. He was instantly shot. The old man to whom the ass belonged, was sitting near us, quietly smoking his chibouk. One of the robbers came behind and shot him in the back. The ball probably reached the heart, for he leapt forward and fell dead. It was daylight, and therefore earlier than our usual hour of moving, but Simos thought our position dangerous, and we commenced our march towards the house of his friend.

"'You must not suppose,' he said to me, 'that I like this bloodshed. It gives me great pain, but it is one of the misfortunes of my profession.'

"'I can understand,' I said, 'your shooting the Turk. If I were a Greek, I would shoot a Turk whenever I could. But why did you shoot the poor old man, who had been living with you, sleeping with you, eating with you, for three days?'

"'I did not do it,' he answered, 'Pericles did it; he is a young hand, and thoughtless. If I had known what he was going to do I should have stopped him, but as it has been done there is no use in fretting about it.' He was much elated at his victory, and wrote an insulting letter to the Pasha, and another to Mr. James Whittall, raised our ransom to 100,000 piastres, or £9000, and sent the letters off by a shepherd, whom he found on the mountain."—pp. 196-9.

The bandits finally accepted a ransom of £500, and Simos, upon parting with the Doctor, shook him cordially by the hand, and gave him a sovereign to pay his expenses home. When Mr. Senior showed his notes of Dr. McCrith's story to Mr. Whittall, that gentleman showed him some of the letters alluded to in the story, which Mr. Senior copied. The first is from Dr. McCrith.

(No. I.)

"To Mr. J. Whittall,—We are in the hands of the robbers,

near Hadry Lao. They demand £3000. We are five. They say not to send any Turks after us.

(Signed) James McCrith."

(No. II.)

Κυριε σορ Βιτταλ

Αν δεν λυπηση τον ιατρον, και δεν στελλη τα χρηματα αυριον το μεσημερον, στελλε ανθρωπον να φερει το κεφαλιτον του, χωρις αλλο.

μη ολοκανδατε πως σας γραφωμεν διαφορετικα

γρουσια 100,000

ροτισε τε επαθον οι Τurκοι. Εφυγονα πο ενδο χωρις αρματα. Εθελον να βαζω την επιγραφην του ιατρον αλλα ειναι εις αλλο μερος

Καπιταν Σιμος και παιδες.

Thus translated by Mr. Whittall.

"Mr. Sir Whittall,

"If you do not pity the Doctor, and if you do not send the money before to-morrow at noon, send a man to take his head, and nothing else.

"Do not resent our writing to you thus strangely.

"Piastres 100,000.

"Ask what the Turks have suffered. They fled from here, leaving their arms. I wished to send the signature of the Doctor, but he is in another place,

(Signed) Captain Simos and his children.

(No. III.)

"Mr. J. Whittall,

"They threaten to kill me, if a sum of money is not sent, 40,000 piastres. No Turks to be sent.

(Signed) James McCrith.

"To be sent to (illegible) to-morrow. They order me to write; see what you can collect. My wife can collect something."

In Greece Proper the brigands seem to be even bolder and more cruel; and Mr. Senior has made extracts from several letters written by an Englishman and his family, who had settled in Greece, and had engaged in some industrial enterprise the nature of which is not mentioned. The letters describe the sack of the house and village by a band of robbers, who cut, maimed, and tortured with boiling oil, according as their fancy prompted them. They carried off two thousand dollars in money, and smashed everything they could not carry away. The letters include a very touching account of the scene, given by one of the daughters of the family, who afterwards died of the shock. A little farther on one of the letters alludes to a robber who

had taken part in the plunder of several villages not long previously, and had tortured three poor women in a way that the writer says makes one sick with horror. After having burned one of the women to death, he was amnestied by the government, and at the date of the letter was living in affluence. If this be the state of things that is to succeed the Turkish government in Constantinople, it is plain it cannot hold very long; but a society in which such things not only exist, but are encouraged by the State, does not present very desirable materials out of which to construct a new Greek empire. If, however, the Greek empire be withdrawn from the innumerable combinations suggested for the settlement of the Turkish question, the question itself does not seem to be a whit nearer its solution. Let us suppose the Turks expelled without interference on the part of the protecting powers, or rather without a war between the powers. The supposition is a rather violent one, but even adopting it, what are we to expect? The creation perhaps of four or five independent states, of which Albania might be one, Egypt another, the Danubian provinces a third, and so on. Now it is difficult to conceive that all this could be quietly arranged by diplomacy, when the single question of the union of the Danubian provinces has created so many jealousies and heart-burnings, and has not yet been determined. If instead of the union of two virtually independent provinces a congress had to settle the boundaries of four or five new states, and their forms of government, no one generation could expect to see the end of it. In the first place, the provinces would be in military occupation during the conferences, and the assignment of the districts to the various occupying armies would hardly take place without diplomatic entanglements. If, however, that preliminary difficulty be surmounted, and we find the four armies of Austria, France, England, and Russia, in possession of Turkish territory, each power will have a "material guarantee" for the enforcement of its own views, and each army will have a proper supply of rifled artillery, to the arbitrament of which the entire question will be ultimately submitted. And, indeed it seems to be scarcely doubtful that an equitable division of the Turkish territory amongst the protecting powers would afford the fairest chances for civilization and strength, if they even could agree upon an allotment. From the advances made by

Russia on a former occasion to our government, it is pretty evident she would be willing to come to an arrangement with us, and there is no reason to believe that she would hold back from an understanding with France and Austria, if those powers could agree as to their own pretensions. Austria would perhaps be the most easily satisfied of the four, as the Danubian provinces would exactly suit her, and in no respect disturb the balance of power. But could England, who so determinedly opposes the cutting of the Isthmus of Suez, ever be brought to consent to the transfer of Egypt and Syria to France? Would any bribe of islands, or any possible share of the continent, induce her to commit the highway of India to the keeping of France? If not, on the other hand, would anything short of utter helplessness and ruin ever compel France to endure the sovereignty of England in Egypt? And, last of all, would any of the powers commit to Russia the power of sealing up the entrance of the Black Sea by the possession of Constantinople? For the peace of Europe, the longer the odious and wasting dominion of the Turks is preserved the better, unless some perfectly unforeseen solution of every difficulty should come, as it of course may come, from year to year. There is no European power of ordinary intelligence which, if in possession of Turkey, or a part of it, would not, as a mere condition of its own existence, transform the country into a comparative paradise. For military and police purposes, if for no other, it would become necessary to intersect the provinces with railroads and carriage roads. A settled government, giving protection to life and property on almost any terms, would attract immigration and capital, and nature would do the rest. Although the Greeks and Armenians may not have the moral or intellectual qualities requisite for the foundation or revival of an empire, they are not, in some respects, a bad element of population. They are producers. They are excellent men of business in a counting-house, if not in a cabinet, and are safe steersmen at the helm of a merchantman, if not at the helm of a state. In fact, the country could hardly fail to be flourishing with even a moderately bad government, that would allow some degree of freedom, and extend some measure of protection to enterprise and industry. It is, unfortunately, more than probable that no great power will be allowed to do this without perhaps staking its own existence upon the effort, in a terrible and exhaust-



ing war. But come what may, it is to be hoped, that European blood will never again be shed for the preservation of the Turkish empire, however inevitable may be its flow in the partition.

Mr. Senior's book is altogether one of the most agreeable books of travel we have met with. It has occasionally a slight flavour of Anglo-Saxonism which is not quite pleasant, but you rarely find so little of it in a book of the kind. The author's opinions are seldom brought prominently forward, but when they do come out, they are given with candour and good sense, which of course implies the absence of presumption. It greatly recommends a book to the reader, when he feels that it is an exact transcript of what he might himself have learned and noted under similar circumstances. You at once feel in reading Mr. Senior's *Journal*, that had you been in Turkey and Greece, with the same opportunities, you would infallibly have asked the same questions and have been similarly answered. There are none of those drafts upon your credulity in which other writers deal, and which you are required to honour at sight; and if occasionally you meet with crude and confident opinions, you know they are only given as specimens, without which the collection would be incomplete. But, in truth, most of the opinions collected by Mr. Senior seem to have been given with sufficient modesty. They are usually those of experienced men, long resident in the country, and familiar with its capabilities and wants. They have nearly all witnessed the bursting of innumerable bubbles, and the failure of the best advertised patent medicines. The ambassadors, consuls, and other diplomatic agents, are the operators, and whatever diversity of opinion exists amongst the lookers on, all agreed that the patient is dying of the doctor quite as much as of the disease. M. de Porceaugnac, pursued by the doctors, would be a good illustration of the Turkish empire, under the treatment of the ambassadors; were it not that M. de Porceaugnac offers a steady resistance to the faculty, and finally puts it to the rout, without having so much as tasted a drug. Turkey, on the contrary, is obliged to swallow everything prescribed for her, and to submit to every operation by turns, or to several at a time. One ambassador prescribes an emollient, another a soothing draught, a third a good drastic purgative, and a fourth

a stiff astringent. Russia advises blood letting, but has three to one against her on the consultation, whereas France and England are for bandages and compresses. One protector administers his globules of homœopathic poison, in the shape of minute reforms, while an equally determined Allopathist forces down a sweeping drench in the nature of a Hatt-i-Humáyoon. The patient draws nothing but despair from the "well-spring of hope," and he is dying by inches of the "life pills." All this has been witnessed for years perhaps by those whose opinions Mr. Senior has collected with so much apparent, and we doubt not real faithfulness; and there are few of them who do not say that the disease is one wherein the patient must minister to himself, and that his first chance of a prolonged existence is the withdrawal of the doctors. They seem to be pretty well agreed also that the patient will not minister to himself; and perhaps Sir Joseph Yorke's cold water cure, of half an hour's submersion in the adjoining seas, would be as practicable a cure as any that has yet been recommended or enforced for Turkey.

Mr. Senior gives almost the entire text of the famous Hatt-i-Humáyoon, as he does of the almost equally inoperative Greek Constitution. The provisions, at least the leading provisions of the Hatt-i-Humáyoon, are generally well known; and the measure itself is an almost perfect charter of civil and religious liberty, if it could have a serious application, which it admittedly cannot, except within the capital and a small zone around it. That Christian and Turk should ever stand upon a substantial, as distinguished from a theoretic, equality, before the law, such as it is, has been universally considered impossible by those best qualified to form an opinion. Where two races are animated towards each other by no feelings but those of hatred, contempt, and fear; and one of those races has enjoyed an unrestricted and unquestioned ascendancy for hundreds of years, equality cannot be created by the letter of any statute or decree. When the calendar had been regulated by Julius Cæsar, it was regarded in Rome more as a freak of arbitrary power than as what it really was, the result of a scientific calculation; and when some one happened to observe to Cicero, that the sun would rise at such an hour, on such a day, the orator inquired with a sneer, "num ex edicto?" But neither by edict, nor in

any other way, will union or good neighbourhood grow up between Greek and Turk.

—Nullus amor populis nec fœdera sunt.

Their relations have been too well fixed, as those of oppressor and oppressed, of master and slave, to be now unsettled by a decree, and especially by a decree known to be insincere, and not to represent the genuine, unconstrained will of the sovereign. The decree will have the single effect of supplying new occasions of interference to the ambassadors, where its application is possible, and of aggravating oppression where the Christians are beyond its reach. Very many of those consulted by Mr. Senior were of opinion that it is one of the measures most fatal to Turkey, although some few were found to say, that if enforced, its influence would be salutary, not only to the Christians, who should be the immediate gainers, but to the State at large.

Every educated Englishman who visits the Troad, seems to consider himself bound in duty to determine the site of ancient Troy. He is not disturbed in the least by the analytic tendencies of modern criticism, which, after decomposing Homer into a dozen of street ballad-singers, would fain dissolve Troy into nothing. Few scholars, would like to have so beautiful an illusion as Troy, if indeed it were an illusion, disturbed; but, on the other hand, there are few philosophic historians who do not as firmly believe in a war of Troy as in the Siege of Sebastopol. Homer is as little likely to have invented the Siege of Troy, or even its main incidents, as Tasso to have invented the Siege of Jerusalem. He might have amused, and probably did amuse his fancy with the invention in the *Odyssey*, although it is not unlikely that Ulysses, like our Richard I., may have been detained for years upon his return from Troy, and so have supplied a substantial foundation for the story; but it is little short of impossible that any one at a period not very remote from the events which he has immortalized, should invent as a pure fiction, so remarkable a historic occurrence as a confederation of the Kings of Greece to subdue and destroy an empire, which, for those times, must have been great, since it required such a force, and so long a time for its overthrow. The fact, moreover, that he chose for his subject an episode merely, in a long war, is proof that he drew

from a tradition, with which the people of his day were perfectly familiar; and at all events it is a fact, that no English scholar visits the Troad without endeavouring to fix, for his own satisfaction, the site of every event in the *Iliad*.

The perfect geographical accuracy of Homer, and the faithfulness of his epithets as applied to natural objects, raise a strong presumption of his having correctly represented the site of Troy. Its position is determined from the *Iliad*, by reference to great landmarks, such as mountains and rivers, and as is inevitable in such cases, there may readily be two or more sites to which the description will apply. Mr. Senior fixes upon a village called Bounar-Bashi, as in the immediate neighbourhood of the site of ancient Troy, and goes at length into the grounds of his opinion. It does seem, certainly, to unite more geographical accidents in its favour than any other theory, and this much at least may be said for the neighbourhood of Bounar-Bashi, that it could have been the site of ancient Troy, and that there is no inconsistency in supposing it to be so. Mr. Senior brings together a good many circumstances, small in themselves, but the cumulative strength of which is not inconsiderable, and which go very far in support of his views. The sepulchral mounds, of which several exist in the plain of Troy, have nearly all been opened and found to correspond very closely in structure with the Homeric *σῆμα*. Tradition has assigned the names of Achilles and Patroclus, and others of the Grecian princes, to some of those mounds which do certainly appear to occupy the exact position given to them in the *Iliad*, but neither human remains nor urns have been found in any of them, although what are called the jar tombs of a much more modern date, are found all over the Troad. But whatever be the value of the controversy, it will always give us pleasure to find educated Englishmen take an unabated interest in scenes and places such as those, because it will always be evidence, that the studies in which the fame and greatness of England have been nursed are still in favour. The English gentleman is the creation of the public schools and universities, and as such, is as local and peculiar in his constitution as any British production that is most purely British. He lives in an atmosphere of classic tradition, and carries about with him a "genius loci" from Eton and

Harrow, like a household god. The Frenchman has gone to "college" at the rather tender age of six, has graduated at sixteen, having crammed for his "Baccalaureat" out of a "manual;" and then sets up for a man upon a large stock of confidence, and little else, before the English boy has left school. The German accumulates a quantity of minute yet cumbrous learning upon particles and points; and a prodigious amount of valuable criticism for the profit of others; but the Englishman is the one of all others who reads for enjoyment; and yet not as a dilettante or with prejudice to his habits of business or vigour of thought.

We close Mr. Senior's book with a feeling of having been profitably and agreeably employed, and we can only express a hope that the conflict of opinions regarding the present and future of Turkey, to which he introduces us, may find a more satisfactory and peaceful solution, than any at present within the reach of speculation. In all human probability, and according to all historical analogy, there is harder work cut out in Turkey for diplomatists as well as generals than they have as yet had to cope with; and if honesty be in fact the best policy, the sooner it forms a part of diplomatic training, and undergoes the test of competitive examination, the better for Turkey, as well as for ourselves.

ART. V.—*The Life and Contemporaneous Church History of Antonio De Dominis*, Archbishop of Spalatro, afterwards Dean of Windsor, Master of the Savoy, and Rector of West Ilsley, in the Church of England. By Henry Newland, D.D., Dean of Ferns. 8vo. Oxford and London: Parker, 1859.

A FITTING Life of De Dominis would be a valuable contribution to the post-Reformation history, as well of the Church which he deserted, as of that in which for a time his strange fortunes were cast. Independently of the interest which necessarily attaches to the personal history of so notorious a character, there are few topics of importance which are not directly or indirectly involved in his career. Abroad, it connects itself with the anti-papal

struggle of the Venetian Republic ; with the workings of that hidden Protestantism or Rationalism, which for a time spread itself over many of the cities of northern Italy; and with the singularly complicated relations of Church and State, which arose from the intermixture of two parties so opposed to each other, but yet closely united by a common principle of opposition to a common enemy. In England it brings us into contact not only with those shadowy projects of church-union, with which the churchmen of the days of James I. flattered or amused their imagination, but also with the hard realities of that struggle between Calvinism and Arminianism, which has never yet died out in the English Church : it opens up a curious episode in the life of the king himself, to whose tastes and love of controversial divinity the advent of De Dominis was a most acceptable god-send : it might serve, if happily investigated, to throw light on those obscure relations with Spain, of which Buckingham was at once the inspirer and the instrument, and which, while they excited so much jealousy in England at the time, have left but little actual trace in English history.

These and many similar subjects of inquiry naturally range themselves round the history of a character such as De Dominis, who, without being personally a prominent actor in any of them, nevertheless had relations with each, and was intimately associated with some of the most active agents and negotiators in them all. We had hoped, when we saw Dr. Newland's *Life* announced, that the want which had existed was about to be supplied ; and although we could not, from the antecedents of the writer, promise that we should be able to accept his views of the history without reserve, yet we felt sure that his book would at least open up an interesting field for inquiry, and that, even where we should be obliged to dissent from his judgments, we should at least be supplied with means of further and more satisfactory investigation. This hope, indeed, would have naturally been suggested by the publication, among the indexes to the contents of the State-paper Office, for which we are indebted to the zeal of the Master of the Rolls, of the "*Domestic Calendars of the Reign of James I.*," which refer to many letters and other documents connected with De Dominis. But we were deeply disappointed to find that Dr. Newland was not aware of the existence of these papers until after his volume had gone through the

press, and that his biography hardly contains a single new or unpublished document. It would be difficult, indeed, to imagine a greater misnomer than the title which he has selected. The book literally is nothing more than a superficial but stormy tirade against popery, with a few incidents from the life of De Dominis, as pegs on which to hang the disjointed fragments of invective of which it consists. And the incidents are just those which are to be found in the commonest biographical dictionary; and if stripped of the theological disquisitions in which they are literally buried, hardly equal, as far as regards length, the article on De Dominis in the "Biographie Universelle." Dr. Newland has not succeeded in ascertaining a single new particular of the early life of De Dominis. He has not even correctly put together the facts which are already known, and which might have been ascertained from the commonest and most accessible sources. His account of the life of De Dominis, up to the time of his being made bishop, occupies just three quarters of a page, and even this miserable scrap is full of the strangest inaccuracies. It is hardly worth while to note them. We need scarcely say that Arba, (correctly written *Arbe*.) the birth-place of De Dominis, is not in *Dalmatia*, as Dr. Newland states, (p. 1), but *an island off the coast of Illyria*. De Dominis did not "receive his early education at *Padua*," (p. 1.) but at *Loreto*, in the so-called Illyrian college, founded for youths of his own nation. He taught philosophy not at *Bressia*, (p. 27), as the Dr. Newland has it, but at *Brescia*. The see to which he was first appointed, was not *Segnia*, (p. 2) (*Segni*), which, as every one knows, is a town in the Papal States, but *Sénia*, (the present Senga, or Zengh, on the coast of Dalmatia.) He was not *twenty* years, (p. 2), but only *two*, bishop of that see. In a word, Dr. Newland appears to have taken his information, not alone entirely at second hand, but without even the most ordinary appreciation of the proprieties of biographical exactness.

From this meagreness of biographical materials, Dr. Newland, in order to make up his volume to the prescribed dimension, has been driven to every imaginable expedient of bookmaking. There is not a topic of popular controversy which he has not contrived to drag in. Not alone those with which the personal history of Dr. Dominis might be supposed to be connected, but many others with which it

has not the slightest imaginable relation :—as the reading of the Bible, the worship of the blessed Virgin Mary, purgatory, tradition, transubstantiation, the mass, the Latin Liturgy, the supremacy of the Pope, even down to the apostolical succession, and the validity of Anglican orders, into which latter question he plunges for the space of sixteen pages, apropos of one of the very few facts which he relates of De Dominis during his residence in England—his assisting at the consecration of the bishops of Bristol and Lincoln, at Lambeth. And we must add, that we have not discovered in the mass of extraneous matter in which he has thus buried the meagre facts of the narration, a single original thought, or one argument, or source of argument, either new in itself or placed in a new or more striking point of view.

The story of Marc Antonio de Dominis may be briefly told. He was born, as we said, in the little island of Arbe, about 1566, and educated at the Illyrian college at Loreto, whence he passed to the university of Padua, in which university he was for a time the scholar of the celebrated Antonio Riccoboni. Having entered the society of the Jesuits, he was, according to their well-known usage, for some years engaged in teaching in different schools of the order. He taught rhetoric at Verona, and mathematics at Padua ; at Brescia he taught successively rhetoric, logic, and natural philosophy ; and while thus engaged he was also occasionally employed in preaching, and, according to his own statement, in other weighty affairs of the Society. These comparatively lowly occupations, however, were but little to the taste of one whom even his panegyrist confesses to have “ become too much elated in consequence of his acquirements, and who therefore desired more than was meet, the honours which the world generally bestows on the results of high mental education.” (p. 1.) Having obtained his secularization, he was appointed to the See of Senia, in 1602, and after an interval of two years to the archiepiscopal see of Spalatro, the chief city, and one of the three* metropolitan churches of Dalmatia, although Dr. Newland, in his desire to enhance the dignity of his hero, and the importance of his accession to the ranks of Protestantism, describes it, in his title-page, as “includ-

* See Wiltseh, *Kirchliche Statistik und Geographie*, ii. p. 106.

ing the kingdoms of Dalmatia and Croatia." The particulars of his administration of the see of Spalatro are very imperfectly known, nor has Dr. Newland added anything to our knowledge of them. His account of the circumstances which led to his abandonment of Romanism is as follows:—

"The Archbishop was led by a mind naturally strong, and a meditative disposition, aided by the resources of an almost universal acquaintance with ecclesiastical history, to discover that the claim of the Pope to supremacy had no just foundation. In fact, it derived as little sanction from the past, and the heads of the Church in ancient times, as it has ever done from the revealed Word of God. At this propitious moment De Dominis became acquainted, at Venice, with Bishop Bedell. He was at that time chaplain to Sir Henry Wotton, who was ambassador from the court of James I. in that city. Happily, the Archbishop's intercourse with so able and devoted a man at the auspicious moment of these investigations, tended, in a considerable degree, as well to settle and deepen these convictions in his mind, as to awaken in his affections a love and admiration of his new friend. He was at last induced boldly to avow the change in his opinions, to which he had been long verging. He had been determined not hastily to avow this change, or to build his faith in the reformed doctrines on a sandy foundation. He was well aware of the eminent position to which his great abilities and acquirements had elevated him; he was most anxious to be enabled to present to the public a satisfactory justification for his secession from the Church of Rome. He therefore entered at once and at large upon an accurate examination of all the peculiar doctrines by which her creed is contradistinguished from the ancient Catholic Church. He was taught to believe that the nearest image to the truth was developed and embodied in the articles, ritual, and formularies of the Church of England. By the most elaborate quotations from the writings of the early Fathers, he satisfactorily convinced himself that the Church, to the highest honours of which he had been elevated, except the throne of the Pope and the principedom of a Cardinal, had most egregiously departed from the pure doctrines of the Gospel. The doubts thus begotten in his mind he anxiously revealed to Bishop Bedell. He produced for his inspection, and as evidence of patient and judicious search after truth, ten books of his famous and justly celebrated work, *De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ*. The Bishop most joyfully received and perused with care this learned and able work, and availed himself of the opportunity thus presented to amend many incorrect quotations, as well of the Word of God as of the early Fathers, particularly those of the Greek Church. The Archbishop was well aware of and acknowledged his deficiency in Grecian literature, and therefore willingly submitted to the emendations of his learned and pious friend. From

this period these two distinguished men became so intimately and affectionately attached to each other, that De Dominis constantly affirmed 'I can do nothing without Bedell.'"—pp. 3-5.

The allusion to Bedell in the above extract is another example of the exceeding looseness and carelessness of this compilation. It can hardly be supposed that Dr. Newland imagines Bedell to have been bishop of Kilmore while he was resident at Venice, as chaplain of the British Embassy. Yet both here, and in several other places, he speaks of him under this designation, and as though he was actually an Anglican bishop while De Dominis was in communication with him. Thus he breaks out into rapturous speculations as to how "these three eminent divines and scholars, *Bishop* Bedell, Paul Sarpi, and the Archbishop of Spalatro, must have enjoyed a most charming intercourse with each other. The times they lived in; the interesting events that were daily crowded into them; the state of Venice, so rich in mind and public spirit, vibrating between slavery and freedom, and not unlike some of the Italian kingdoms in our own days, wavering between the darkness of religious error and the holy light that issued from the cause of the Reformation; the perplexity that hung over the advocates of Romish ascendancy; the liberty that waked new life in the souls of the people; the open and proclaimed adherence to the Reformation by Spalatro; the more steadfast yet more secret adhesion to its mighty though not openly avowed truths by Father Paul, and the calm yet ardent faith of the pure and holy Bedell, must have imparted an exciting interest to the intimate correspondence which their kindred hopes and illustrious minds had displayed on the subjects that engaged and engrossed their thoughts and affections as well as the public mind." In another place he argues, (p. 8,) that "in an equal degree the heavenly aspirations of Paul Sarpi may have had considerable effect in moderating the controversial zeal of *the Bishop*." In a word, whenever he mentions Bedell's residence at Venice it is under the same designation.

Neither Dr. Newland's book, nor any of the meagre biographies of De Dominis, supply materials for a satisfactory investigation of the motives under which he acted in his temporary abandonment of the Catholic faith. Of course Dr. Newland can see nothing in it but the influence of the pure light of the Gospel, and the simple attractions

of that primitive faith, to which the Anglican Church had happily returned under her first reformers. We shall probably find another occasion when, as may soon be expected, the authentic materials for a biography, which are known to exist, shall have been made public, for returning to this portion of the subject. For the present we shall content ourselves with a few observations on Dr. Newland's narrative, partial and imperfect as it is.

Perhaps it may be thought worthy of remark that Dr. Newland never alludes to the circumstance, that, when De Dominis resolved on withdrawing from the Church, he took the precaution of resigning his see (a very desirable preferment, if we may believe Dr. Newland) in favour of his relative, Sforza Pontone. Perhaps Dr. Newland could not suppose that any calculation of purely temporal things could have entered into the views of the intended neophyte of Anglicanism; but probably the reader will think that he ought not to have withheld so noticeable a circumstance, especially, as we shall find later, that even when the convert's mind had fully opened to the new light of the Anglican Gospel, he was not insensible to such considerations.

Dr. Newland's account of his change of creed is as follows:—

“When the Archbishop had determined to renounce the Church of Rome, he resolved to leave Venice. He did not publish his intentions till he considered himself safe from the persecution of papal vengeance. We learn from a small tract published in 1616 in London, entitled ‘A Parcel of Observations upon the Former Decree,’ that this precaution was necessary. He had retired from Dalmatia into the city of Venice, and after a short delay there directed his course to Switzerland. From Coire, a chief town of the Grisons, he communicated to the senate of Venice his determination to leave the Church of Rome. From thence he pursued his journey towards Germany, and published at Heidelberg, in Latin, the book which afterwards appeared in England with this title:— ‘A Manifestation of the Motives whereupon the Most Reverend Father Marcus Antonius De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, in the Territorie of Venice, undertooke his Departure thence. Englished out of his Latin copy. At London, printed by John Bill, 1616.’ This book had been privately printed at Venice, but was not published till his arrival in Germany. It is dated from Venice the 20th of September, and was circulated on the 23rd of October following. It was immediately sent to Venice, and the Pope's nuncio despatched it with all haste to Rome.”—pp. 92-93.

From Heidelberg he pursued his journey to the Hague, where he "was received most courteously, by means of the letters which Sir Dudley Carleton had sent to him, and his Excellency Grave Maurice appointed one of the ships of war to convey him to England. A great number of copies of his book were circulated in Holland, and we learn by a letter from his affectionate friend, George Michael Lingelsheim, that it had been reprinted there. He also says,—

"Your departure out of Babylon hath deeply stung and incensed the enemies of truth, so that now already, both at Rome and Milan, edicts are set forth for the prohibiting of your writings, even those you have not published. The Jesuits of Brussels, because it lieth not within their reach to do other mischief, make bold to nibble at your good name, and labour to impair the worth and weight of your authority. But all in vain. For in Venice your most pious papalins do yield you good testimony of your blameless life. Our most renowned prince, the Palgrave, was not a little joyed when notice was given to his Highness of the recovery of your health and your prosperous arrival at the Hague."

This letter is dated the 19th of December, 1616.

"The Archbishop's visit," continues Dr. Newland, "in company with Bedell, to the United Provinces, made him more anxious to go to England. For at this time the Presbyterian controversy was canvassed with that fiery vehemence which has always accompanied its consideration, as well on the Continent as in England. The Presbyterian form of government little accorded to the hierarchical predilections of the Archbishop. But he had always been taught to believe that in England the ancient and apostolical discipline of the Church was judiciously blended with purity of doctrine. Sir Dudley Carleton was at that time ambassador at the Hague. From him he solicited letters of introduction to some persons eminent for their attachment to the principles of the Reformed Church. The Ambassador, in compliance with this request, wrote, on the 10th of June, 1616, to Sir R. Winwood, Secretary of State for Foreign affairs. He says,—

"I have been written unto lately by the Archbishop of Spalatro to send him letters of address to some well-affected persons on the way, he having, as he writes, settled his affairs, and persisting in his former resolution of going to England. Herein I make no diffi-

culty of satisfying him, conceiving it to agree with his Majesty's pleasure.'

"The Archbishop was attended to England by Bedell, and a fellow-convert from the Church of Rome, one Despotine. He was an eminent physician, who afterwards lived near the Bishop at St. Edmondsbury. He was no less distinguished for his professional attainments than for the singleness and sincerity of his religious opinions. One would have supposed that the companion of Bedell needed no other introduction to the society of the learned and the sustaining friendship of pious associates. The Archbishop's intercession with the Ambassador for other acquaintance than those his fellow-traveller could procure, seems to afford a glimpse of a mercenary or vain anxiety to promulgate formally to King James his approach to his kingdom. Sir Dudley Carleton, however, complied with his request, and the venerable neophyte set out for his new asylum."—pp. 94-96.

He arrived in England December 16th, 1616, and in five days after his arrival was admitted to an audience of the king. His reception in England was a regular ovation. The account of his reception at Cambridge, given by Bishop Hacket in his *Life of Archbishop Williams*, is entertaining enough.

"The Bishop of Winchester made a proposition before his Majesty, that whereas the Archbishop of Spalatro, a proselyte much welcomed at that time, was designed to be present at Cambridge Commencement in the next July, that he might behold the University in the fairest trim, and hear the disputation, the best being ever provided for that appearance, that Mr. Williams might be reserved unto that time for a double service, to answer publicly in divinity for the degree of Doctor, the fittest to be the Days man before that learned prelate, and likewise give him hospitality, such as such a guest deserved. So it was ordered, and so it was performed.

"Some men are right learned, yet, with all that worth, steal off the world unknown, because it was their ill hap never to be brought upon the theatre of manifestation; and some are as valiant as the best, and yet are never praised for it, because they were never invited into the field to show it. So Velleius speaks for Sejanus, that he never triumphed, 'non merito, sed materia adipiscendi triumphalia defectus est;' he deserved it, but the matter of a triumph never fell in his way. There are others whom not only deliberate advice, but every casualty and contingency, puts forward to be *aspectabiles*; it conducts them where they may be best viewed,

and their full stature seen upon the advantage of a rising. I fall into this contemplation because an object is before me wherein I may aptly exemplify. Dr. Williams (his title for which he stood in the Act ann. 1617) culled not out gaudy seasons of vain-glory; that cannot be suspected, because he took all his academical degrees in their just year. But He above, that disposeth all things, provided those coincidences of great resort and celebrity, such as Archbishop Spalatro's presence at this Commencement, to his worthiness be known the further.

"It was well for the Doctor that he was a right stag, well breathed, and had a fair head with all his rights, for I never heard a respondent better hunted in all my time that I was a commorant in Cambridge. The opponents were the princes of their tribes, men of renown in their generation, Πολλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοί, who did honour the University that day, to the admiration of Mr. Antonio De Dominis, with the utmost of their learning.

"It were no sin to forget the feasts he made at this solemnity. They were bounteous, nay, excessive, after the usual trespass of the superfluity of our nation, such as Plutarch says Lucullus made in his dining-room which he calls Apollo. One thing deserves a smile, that the Doctor was at no little cost to send to the Italian ordinaries at London, and to ransack the merchants' stores, for such viands as might please the Archbishop Spalatro out of his own country. To which accates it was observed that he never put his hand towards them, but liked our venison and English dishes a great deal better, he thanked them. But enough of this, for many do not like the smell of a kitchen.'"—pp. 98-100.

The reader will hardly fail to be struck by the air of charlatanry which pervades the whole of this part of the career of De Dominis. His ostentatious parade of his new opinions; the effort which he makes to enhance the greatness of his sacrifices in quitting the Church of Rome; the eagerness with which he seeks out opportunities of attracting the notice and the favour of the great, all savour of the tricks of a popular adventurer, who is playing for popularity, and is content to stake all upon the hazard. One of the few sayings which Dr. Newland has recorded of him bears the impress of a coarse, vulgar, and canting mind. "The king," says Dr. Newland, "made him some valuable presents; among others he gave him a silver basin and bowl. On receiving these tokens of court favour, De Dominis remarked, 'The king of Great Britain has sent me a basin and bowl to wash away the filth of the Roman Church, and a silver cup to remind me to drink of the purity of the Gospel.'"

The king, however, had other and better things in store for his distinguished convert. Within a few months of his arrival in England, we find him installed Dean of Windsor, Master of the Savoy, and Rector of West Ilsley; and it speaks badly for the disinterestedness of Dr. Newland's hero, that almost immediately after his installation he was involved in disputes with the tenants who held under the living to which he had been inducted. One of the first acts of this disinterested searcher after Gospel truth was to raise a question as to the validity of the leases which had been granted by his predecessor, and Dr. Newland himself confesses that it was only after a severe reprimand from the Bishop of London, that he relinquished his design! (p. 101.)

The ambition or avarice of De Dominis was far from satisfied by these preferments. He conceived that there was no dignity in the Anglican Church to which he might not with justice aspire; and on the reported death of the Archbishop of York, he actually "applied to the king to consider his claims in the arrangements which he was called on to make in filling up that see!" (p. 145.) Dr. Newland ascribed this step on his part to the crafty suggestions of the Spanish ambassador, whom he represents as employing this as a part of his plan to satisfy the king of the insincerity of De Dominis's conversion, and the interested motives by which he had been influenced. We are not sure whether even his Protestant readers will share in the good Dean's indignation at what he calls the Jesuitical proceedings resorted to by the ambassador for the purpose of exposing the hollowness of the man. We shall not trouble ourselves to discuss the question, especially as this, in common with all the rest of the history of De Dominis in England, must await the publication of the documents as well in our own State-paper Office, as of the despatches of the Spanish ambassador. We shall only say that, even taking the evidence as given by Dr. Newland, the exposure was thoroughly well merited, and plainly demonstrated to his English patrons the utter worthlessness of their seeming triumph in the accession of such a convert. Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, taking advantage of the disappointed ambition of the expectant, obtained for him through the influence of his court a promise of pardon provided he would retract his errors and repair the scandal which had been caused by

his apostasy. On the arrival of the expected document the "Ambassador at once hurried to the Archbishop. The previous arrangements and devices he had employed and so cunningly arranged had prepared the mind of De Dominis for some great change in his fortunes. Gondomar found him still leaning to the proposal which he had so adroitly submitted to him in their last interview. It therefore needed no great expenditure of art or cunning to induce him to sign the recantation. Perhaps the honour he is supposed to have long coveted, the attainment of a cardinal's hat, decided him. However, the paper of his recantation was signed. At once, for no further sacrifice could be demanded, Gondomar, now more than ever rich in the spoils of his triumphant diplomatic ingenuity, hurried to the King, and in a rapid, uncourteous manner, so overjoyed was he at the moment, presented to the King the most unimpeachable evidence, 'That the Archbishop was a papist, and that he had proved him to be one.' His Majesty, as it may well be supposed, was grievously irritated and perplexed. But he determined to act with decision, and deemed it wiser, in order to mark his condemnation in the strongest manner, to wait until the Archbishop conveyed to him the result of his late determination to leave the Church of England and to return to Rome."

The sequel is well known. De Dominis soon afterwards wrote to the king, to communicate his intention of returning to Rome, partly as he alleged from motives of health, partly with a view of forwarding a union of the Churches, but carefully concealing his purpose of seeking reconciliation with the Church of Rome. The king immediately gave a commission to the Bishops of London and Durham, and the Dean of Winchester, to inquire into his intentions. It would be tedious to detail the particulars of this inquiry; it will be enough to say that at the close of the proceedings he was informed by the Archbishop of Canterbury that "it was his Majesty's pleasure, and in his name it was denounced to him, that whereas he had been a suitor unto him for leave to quit England, his Majesty would not grant him permission, but commanded him that within twenty 'days next following, he should depart the kingdom, and all other his Majesty's dominions, at his peril, and never to return again.' He answered, 'that he would obey, but protested on the faith of an honest man, that he

would ever remain a dutiful servant of his Majesty, and a well-wisher of the Church of England, of which he would ever speak well.' The Bishop of Durham then reminded him 'that he had protested he ever would defend and justify the Church of England for an orthodox Church in all the fundamental points of Christianity, and that he would maintain the same even in the presence of the Pope, although he should do it at the hazard of his life.' To this statement the Archbishop of Spalatro replied:—'It was true he had said so, and he would perform it, for the Church of England is very orthodox in all essential points, and as for accidentals, he did not regard them.'" De Dominis, thus doubly a deceiver, quitted England in April, 1622. At Brussels the brief of pardon was communicated to him, on the receipt of which he proceeded to Rome, where he was received with much kindness by Pope Gregory XV., his former friend and fellow-student at Padua, and published in the following year, in the form of an "Exposition of the Reasons of his Return from England," a complete retraction and refutation of the elaborate treatise by which he had signalized his apostasy.

Unhappily, however, this was but another scene in the miserable drama of vacillation or duplicity which this strange life exhibits. Very soon after the publication of this retraction, there appeared reason to suspect the sincerity of its unhappy author. It was ascertained that he was engaged in a correspondence with persons whose opinions were more than suspicious, and the correspondence, being intercepted, betrayed the utter insincerity of the professions which he had so solemnly put forth. He was arrested accordingly, and imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo, in the year 1624. Proceedings were instituted against him by the Inquisition, but before they had advanced very far he was taken ill, and died, it was said, in sentiments of deep penitence, in the September of the same year. Nevertheless, as the charge of heresy did not regard his person alone, but also, and even principally, the works which he had published, the process was continued after his death; and the sentence was pronounced and carried into execution, his remains being exhumed, and, together with his books, burnt publicly in the Campo di Fiori.

Dr. Newland is at great pains to make it appear that De Dominis's return to the Roman Communion was not

the result of any conviction of the truth of the doctrines of the Roman Church, or of the untenableness of those of the Anglican Creed. We shall not trouble ourselves to refute an assumption, utterly groundless, we know, but, even if it were certain, entirely without practical interest. The brief outline of the life of De Dominis already given will disincline every reasonable man to attach the slightest weight to any expression of belief, emanating from one whom he is forced either to pity as a miserable vacillator, or to despise as an unprincipled hypocrite. Notwithstanding the labour which Dr. Newland has wasted upon it, we do not think the question, considered practically, worth the trouble of investigation. Beyond the interest which may attach to it as a curious question of personal history, it is utterly valueless, and possesses no possible interest, in our eyes. If we cared to express an opinion on the personal question, we should not think it necessary to go beyond the very materials collected by Dr. Newland, miserably meagre as they are. It is plain to us that the intellectual nature of De Dominis, whatever may have been his moral constitution—whether he was a vacillator or a hypocrite—was utterly devoid of the dogmatic principle. He had no settled opinions, or rather he was intellectually indifferent to all opinions. We believe of him, as we believe also of his friend and colleague, Paolo Sarpi, that he was at least practically a latitudinarian; that he had established for himself a system not very dissimilar from that of the fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines of Jurieu; and that in his eyes most of the controversies among modern Christians were reducible to the latter class. It cost him no intellectual sacrifice, therefore, to pass from Romanism to Anglicanism, and from Anglicanism back again to Romanism. It is painful to be compelled to add, that we are equally convinced that, while his internal belief was thus undecided, the changes of external profession which marked his extraordinary career, are too clearly traceable to mean and unworthy motives—to pride, disappointment, avarice, and ambition. His apostasy could hardly be regarded as a matter of humiliation; nor did his return to the Church carry with it much either of consolation or of triumph.

ART. VI.—*Vicissitudes of Families*, and other Essays. By Sir Bernard Burke, Ulster King of Arms. London: Longman and Co., 1859.

SIR Bernard Burke is one of the best illustrations, if not the very best, of the right man in the right place. His knowledge of everything relating, not only to genealogy, but to the personal history of great families, is universal and precise. If it be true to say of the poet, that he must be born such, it is equally true of the genealogist; for every true genealogist has more than a mere touch of enthusiasm. To most men the study of genealogy is hopelessly dry, and a table of descent not a whit more inviting than a table of logarithms, and perhaps even more bewildering. Men of the best derived ancestry, and proud of their family, as all well-born people are, would, nevertheless, recoil with something like horror from the investigation of ascending and descending and collateral lines, and remote affinities, and vanishing relationships, all traced upwards, and sideways, and across, and merging and reappearing without end. But, should a man be a born genealogist, no work of art or imagination, no triumph of genius in poetry or oratory, no masterpiece, whether of the human mind or of the human fancy, nothing, in reality or in fiction, will delight him half so much as a good, long, tangled genealogy. Every one is acquainted with men who can tell precise degrees of relationship, with alliances and cross alliances to the eighth or ninth degree, not only in individual families, or in families immediately connected with themselves, but in families with which they have no relationship whatever. And all this seems to come to them without an effort of memory, although the listener, for whom they imagine those matters to have an equal interest with that which they feel themselves, becomes hopelessly confused in the course of the first half minute.

For many friends, and for listeners who may not be friends, an indiscreet and enthusiastic genealogist is a real visitation; and his presence is a trial to be meekly borne, if inevitable; but not to be rashly tempted or incautiously run into. He makes you dizzy with the pedigrees of worthy or worthless people, as the case may be,

but at all events of people about whose alliances or "més-alliances" you care as little as you do about the Danish Dutchies, or the Danubian Principalities, and that is going very far indeed for a subject of interest. But there are some, in the number of whom Sir Bernard Burke takes a foremost place, who have not made their memories into so many marriage registers, but have connected their names with facts and events pleasing to read and profitable to know. In truth, there is hardly a great name amongst the ancient families of Great Britain and Ireland which does not furnish illustrations of those changes and reverses, of which Sir Bernard Burke has collected a few examples into the present volume. Those few are indeed amongst the most signal that could be brought forward as a corrective of pride, and as a reminder of that instability of human things, to which we find almost as frequent allusion in pagan as in Christian morality. The examples drawn from Sir Bernard's store are confined to the history of these kingdoms, but there can be no doubt that every civilized country in Europe would supply instances almost as various and striking as those which are found in our own history. In England and Ireland, to be sure, agencies have been at work which never influenced to the same degree the fate of families in other countries. Up to the period of the French Revolution, there was, strictly speaking, no change of dynasty, from the days of Charlemagne, and not much dynastic war in France, with the exception of the wars of the League, which were in truth religious rather than dynastic, as the Protestantism of Henry IV. was the only substantial objection to his claim. The execrable system of attainder also, and corruption of blood, had less to do with the degradation or extinction of great families on the Continent than in England and Ireland, where confiscation and beggary, even if not extermination, were the necessary consequences of the code so rigorously applied by every successful party to the vanquished. In Ireland especially, there is not one ancient family, whether Irish or Norman, that has not paid the penalty of treason, actual or constructive; and in a religious point of view, the registry of confiscated estates in Ireland is the proudest national martyrology that any country has to show.

In France the Revolution swept away all the old landmarks of property, and although compensation was made

in after times to nearly all the royalists who had gone into emigration, and whose estates had merged in the national property; many an old family was either extinguished or reduced to penury before relief could be of any avail. And even after the greater part of the French nobility had been restored to affluence, and to a commanding position, such as enabled them to take possession of their old domains, or at least of their ancestral castles; even since then the operation of the property laws in France, has tended so to scatter and break up anything like territorial influence, that the greatest names in France are gradually disappearing from her soil as they have already disappeared from her history. With us the case is rather different. Should an old family retrieve its fortunes, the laws, although unfriendly to perpetuity of possession, strict and indefeasible, in one family, still permit the settlement of land in such a way that it may descend from father to son for centuries. But, however some institutions may favour the growth, and some hasten the decay, of families, no institutions can alter the condition of human things, under which all flesh is grass, or give stability to that which must be for ever shifting. No constitution, and no charter, no close entail, or strict settlement, will prevent families, royal or noble, from giving, by reverse, decay, and extinction, their appointed lesson and warning to humanity. The House of Bourbon, that once filled so many thrones, still reigns over fair kingdoms, it is true, but the fairest of them all seems to have passed for ever from both branches of the family of France, and within the last few months the family of Parma has undergone the fate of its elder brother. How soon the Houses of Naples and Spain may go to rejoin that of France and Parma, passing events give no indication, but nothing in the form of disaster should take the House of Bourbon unprepared. Not fifty years ago the then Master of Europe declared, as was the fact, that the last of the Bourbons had ceased to reign in Europe; and yet, in the course of a few years, all the Bourbons had been reinstated, and their deposer died in St. Helena. A few years later, the Bourbons were again driven from France, and the line of Bonaparte restored, and within the last few months we find another Bourbon sovereign obliged to fly from her rebellious subjects, and with hardly a protector or advocate in Europe.

It may fairly be assumed, however, that were there no extraordinary social or political causes at work, the law of change would work the reverses of which we have so many instances in every day life. There will always be as there always have been, examples for the warning and instruction of mankind, although the examples may be heeded neither more nor less than they have been at any period in the history of the world. From time to time the mighty will be put down from their seats, and the humble be raised up, without the presence of any extraordinary agency in human affairs, such as war or revolution; but where, as in England and Ireland, every cause that could have a part in the ruin of families and the extinction of great names, had such full play, it is not surprising that English history should be fertile in accounts such as those of which Sir Bernard Burke's volume is composed. The biography of an extinct family has at least as melancholy an interest for most readers, as that of an individual; and when you find that a noble race, with all its virtues and all its faults, has disappeared from the earth, its faults are most commonly lost in its sufferings. For it requires no small concurrence of circumstances, at least in our own time and in our own country, to pull down a great family from the eminence on which it has been placed, and either reduce it to the vulgar level or extinguish it altogether. The people of England have at all times had a singular reverence for great names and old traditions; a feature in the English character to which much of the stability and grandeur of the country is attributable. But its influence on the destinies of families and individuals is not doubtful. The member of an ancient but decayed family, who exhibits in himself no decay of intellect or vigour, but endeavours to retrieve his fortunes and re-establish his name, is nearly always certain to attract to his cause the interest and sympathies, not only of his own order, but of every rank of men in England. If his character be high, it would not be difficult for him, especially if he should be the owner of a title, to improve his fortunes by an alliance with a family beneath his own in rank, and yet not so far beneath it, as to be what the English world would call unsuitable. And if we consider a great family in the fulness of its strength and numbers, with its multiplied and powerful alliances, with its immense resources, its political influence, the respect, little short of awe, which it commands amongst

its retainers, and the support which it derives from, and restores in its turn, to the institutions of the country ; it would seem at first sight that the ruin or decay of such a family is little short of an impossibility. The power of such a family in England is differently circumstanced from that of a reigning prince. Exalted as is its station, it is sheltered by the greater and more dangerous eminence of the crown, which draws to it all the storms of political commotion, either harmlessly, as in our own government, and as part of our own system ; or, fatally, as too often happens in less fortunate countries. Hence, for more than a century we hardly find any great family of these countries sinking under disasters drawn upon it by mere envy, or resulting from political changes. It may have lost place, power, and influence to a certain degree by political intrigue, but the ruin of no great family within the period we have mentioned, is ascribable to such a cause.

Such however was not the case up to the final extinction of the hopes of the Stuarts, whose misfortunes supply matter for not the least interesting chapter in Sir Bernard's book. Up to that time every English house of name, whether titled or untitled, had taken part in some one or all of the civil wars, from the battle of Hastings to the battle of Culloden. There is not one old family yet existing which has not most probably been attainted and restored more than once during the course of English history ; and by good fortune English records have been so accurately preserved, that the exact number of families, which have perished in those conflicts may be easily determined. We are indebted for the greater part of the treasury of historical information in which England is so rich, to that formalism, to that love of precedent and established procedure, conspicuous in the English, which is blamed by many prudent men, and which is universally laughed at by the shallow. Hardly anything has been done in the way of public robbery, plunder, or confiscation, of either Church or private property, which did not observe decent and constitutional forms, and register itself in the most regular method. Foreigners, and especially Frenchmen are astonished to find the English sovereign at the present day give her assent to acts of parliament in Norman French : and the form of expressing dissent, obsolete, perhaps, but still the only constitutional form, is in the same language. Bills of Exchange and similar securities for

money are still called, "choses in action," husband and wife are still called "Baron" and "Femme." The man whose life is in a lease is called the "cestui que vie," and the beneficiary in a trust is known as the "cestui que trust," greatly to the amusement and much also to the surprise of foreign jurists. It is perhaps a curious development of the English attachment to any form that has once been sanctioned by usage, that the Englishman should adopt and cherish customs which are apparently not only anti-national, but badges of defeat and of foreign supremacy. Perhaps there is nothing quite like it in history; but when we find it to have wrought thus beneficially in the preservation of our records, charters, and other muniments of title, we have reason to be grateful for the existence of a feeling, which has conduced so remarkably to the multiplication of helps in the study of history, such as are found by no other country in anything like the same degree.

But never in the history of any country were such changes brought about in the condition of families by political or other causes, as in Ireland by the combined operation of the potato disease and the incumbered estates court. In some instances the worthy suffered with the unworthy, and the people suffered most of all. Their sufferings came most prominently before the public; but after all, the sufferings of the people, properly so-called, were not the most intense, nor will the change wrought by their depopulation prove to have been the greatest. The nation will repeople itself, and is doing so, but one class in the greater part of Ireland has been so nearly removed by the disastrous years from '45 to 50, that it never can again be what it was. The nation has little reason to regret the purge, to which, what was known as the Irish gentry, was subjected in the years alluded to. So far as the class, so misnamed, has been thinned, the country is the gainer. The *Times*, when it found the comparison to suit its purpose, likened the instincts and habits of the Irish gentry to those of the wolf and the jackal; and certainly there never existed in a civilized country a class so irreclaimably bad as that which disappeared to a great extent during the years of the fatal failure. The Norman settlers in Ireland had the faults of their time. They were tyrannous, cruel, and rapacious, but, on the other hand, they had some idea of religion, and in the course of time, while the invaders and

the invaded professed the same faith, the Lords of the Pale contracted relations so kindly and intimate with the native Irish, that it was found necessary to sever those relations by legislative enactments. As soon, however, as the change of religion took place in England, and a foreign Church establishment was imposed upon the Irish, things began to alter. The Norman, as well as the native Irish, adhered generally to the old faith, and it was not until after the Ulster plantation and the victories of Cromwell, that the late Irish gentry, in every respect the wickedest and the meanest oligarchy in the world, was finally established. Composed in a great measure of Cromwellian troopers, men who lived a life of the grossest license under the banners of the most austere fanaticism, it was suffered, by the blindness of the Restoration, to take root in Ireland. The same government that proscribed the parliamentary regicides in England with such unsparing rigour, allowed their common soldiers to remain the lords of Ireland, to the prejudice of those who had spent their blood and their fortunes in the service of the crown. A comparatively small number of the old families, native as well as Norman, had preserved their lands by apostasy, political and religious. The number of those who, under the act of settlement, retained their lands as innocent papists, or received others in exchange, was still farther reduced by the issue of the Williamite wars; and when the Prince of Orange was at length established on the English throne, the gentry of Ireland, as the term is popularly used, had almost nothing in common with either the English gentry of the time, or with the old aristocracy of the Irish Pale. Originally, ill-conditioned and ferocious, it improved in ferocity under the protection and encouragement of successive English princes. The Irish gentry were regarded by the English government as useful savages of the bull-dog type, not very intelligent or sagacious, and as likely to tear their masters as any body else, unless well kept down; but who, if pampered at the same time, and properly trained, would tear, as of preference, those whom they were taught to tear, their natural enemies, the native Irish. In the course of a few years the late English settlers lost every virtue of the English character, and to their coarser vices superadded all those of the slaves, over whom they were appointed to rule. Their hospitality was a debauch; their courage a drunken

frenzy; their insolence to the weak was only to be equalled by their slavishness to those in power; their corruption was so portentous as to make modern corruption seem virtue by comparison. It is difficult, of course, to determine what the Protestant religion is; but it would be still more difficult to determine what was the religion of the Irish parliament. It followed the Rake's progress, however, and committed suicide in College Green, only after a more comfortable fashion than the celebrated Felo-de-se on Hampstead Heath.

It was not, however, until the year 1846 that the manifest judgment of heaven included that worst and meanest specimen of an oligarchy in its visitation. The incumbered estates court acted in aid of the famine, and the land of Ireland was to a great extent wrested from the dead but unrelaxed hand of insolvency, and given over to those who could make it profitable to themselves and to the country.

This, however, was not to be accomplished without much individual suffering; and it is impossible not to be moved by the miseries of the innocent descendents of these most unworthy ancestors. Amongst those of the Norman race, who apostatized from their creed in religion and politics, were the family of Martin of Connemara, which afterwards afforded, in the third or fourth generation, a signal, but by no means a singular example of an almost adequate punishment of the crimes of its ancestors. Sir Bernard Burke gives a touching description of the fortunes of the last heiress of the Martins of Connemara, which is more impressive in its modern reality, than many which, though equally real, are mellowed and made romantic by antiquity.

"Who has not heard of the eccentric but benevolent Richard Martin, the Lord of Connemara, the renowned for hospitality in a land of hospitality, and for many years the representative of the County of Galway in the British House of Commons? Weighed accurately in the scales of merit, he may have fallen short of his ancestors. Most certainly he was not the man to have accumulated the family estates; but somehow his name stands out to the eclipse of those who went before him, and I am thus tempted to give him a momentary precedence.

"Even those who have forgotten the eccentricities of this singular character, will yet recollect him in connection with a certain act 'for preventing or punishing cruelty to animals,' an act which

is still probably known under his name, 'Dick Martin's Act.' Nor did he content himself with having obtained this parliamentary defence for his four-footed clients, and then leaving the carrying of it out to others ; he was equally strenuous in seeing that they had the full benefit of the law enacted for their protection, and when he was in London never failed to bring up before the police magistrates such delinquents as had the ill-luck to come under his eye, when he would press the law against them to its utmost. There was something of the *το γελαῖον*, of the ridiculous, which for some time accompanied his best efforts, but eventually the cause of humanity was triumphant.

"In Connemara, where, like Selkirk upon the island of Juan Fernandez, 'he was monarch of all he surveyed,' and could do pretty well as he pleased, without the intervention of a magistrate, his benevolence took a shorter cut to its object ; and the memory of his doings in behalf of his dumb friends is perpetuated in the ruins of an ancient fortalice upon the shores of Ballinahinch lake. The peasants of the neighbourhood still know those mouldering fragments by the name of *Dick Martin's Prison*, and will tell how the Lord of Connemara used, in the somewhat doubtful exercise of his feudal rights, to confine therein such of his tenants as sinned against the laws of humanity towards the brute creation. But I must now leave this redresser of animal grievances, and trace my steps back to the commencement of my story.

"The founder of the Martyn family in Ireland was Oliver Martyn, who accompanied the English army under Strongbow, and settling in Galway, originated one of the thirteen tribes in that ancient town. But the prosperity of the race would seem to have been greatly increased in the time of Captain Richard Martin, of Donegan, who received large grants from the confiscated possessions of the O'Flaherties of Connaught. He was a warm partisan of James II., and after the abdication, or more properly, the flight of that monarch, joined for a time the so-called Irish army. It seems, however, that he knew how to trim his sails to the wind, for, upon the Jacobite cause becoming manifestly hopeless, he submitted to king William, and had the good fortune to retain his lands. He then petitioned the reigning Sovereign that he might be allowed to erect his estates into a manor, urging as a ground for this request, his desire to improve the property, by encouraging dealers and handicraftsmen of every kind to become settlers upon it. His prayer was accordingly granted, by a patent dated July 5, 1698, which, moreover, ratified the title of all his previous acquisitions. Nor was it probably any drawback to his satisfaction, that he had constantly to fight with some one or other for the maintenance of those new rights, which, in proportion as they enlarged his bounds, had curtailed those of his neighbours. Amongst the most troublesome of the enemies so roused up against him, was Edmund O'Flaherty, surnamed *Laidier*, or the Stony, who was far

from tamely acquiescing in the alienation of his paternal territories. Many and desperate were the conflicts between the chieftains, for the most part sword in hand, on horseback. But the praise of chivalry must, we think, in fairness be awarded to the *Laider*, who seems to have trusted in a great measure to his own good right arm. Martin being always surrounded by a troop of followers ran comparatively little risk, while the more adventurous O'Flaherty had often to cut his way to safety through opposing numbers by dint of superior strength.

"The estate of the Martins might well be called a principality. Situated in the county of the town of Galway, and in the baronies of Moycullen, Ballinahinch, and half barony of Ross, in the county of Galway, it contained upwards of one hundred and ninety-two thousand statute acres, and extended almost uninterruptedly from the town of Oughterard to Clifden and Claggan Bays, a distance of at least thirty miles, having the navigable lough Corrib on the north of the Bay of Galway, and the Atlantic ocean on the south and south-western boundaries. Yet their dwelling of Ballinahinch, although styled a castle, was unworthy of the surrounding land. The prodigious extent of the demense may be imagined from the fact that the grandfather of the last possessor could boast to George the Fourth, 'he had an approach from his gatehouse to his hall of thirty miles length.' Were the greater part of these enormous demenses either rock or moorland, there would be less matter for surprise; but such is not altogether the fact; the whole is infinitely diversified with lakes, glens, rivers, and some portion of cultivated land, though far below what the soil would naturally admit of. Many of these waters exhibit scenes of surpassing beauty, their wide surface being broken by beautifully wooded islets. There are about sixty-four of the larger of such watery oases, not to mention a multitude of islets, that occur singly or in clusters, and are not the less lovely from often presenting themselves in the midst of desolation. Moreover, the whole coast, washed by the Atlantic, is indented with numerous bays, offering the same panorama of islands that seem to float upon the reflecting element. And then, as might be expected from the natural history of Ireland, the waters abound with salmon and trout, while the land is not less amply provided with grouse, woodcocks, and divers sorts of water-fowl, which make a country life so delectable to sportsmen. At the same time, amidst all these agreeable attractions, there is no want of the useful. The sea affords an abundant supply of manure for agricultural purposes, various parts are rich in blue limestone, and in the *Twelve Pine Mountains* are inexhaustible quarries of marble. Nothing is wanted but the hand of industry, aided by modern science, to make Connemara equal to some of the favoured regions of the earth, unless I must add thereto a healthier social system and a better education for the people.

"Within this prodigious extent of territory, the Martins exer-

cised something very nearly akin to feudal rule, the arms of the law being much too short, on most occasions, to stretch into the wilds of Connaught. They were lords paramount. Every head was bowed in submission to the owners of thousands upon thousands of acres, which if not generally remarkable for cultivation, impressed the imagination by extent. Yet immense and almost unbounded as the estate was, the seeds of decay had been sown on it by the profuse hospitality of its improvident owners, and with such marvellous rapidity did they spread, that when Richard Martin ceased to be returned to Parliament he was fain to take refuge from his creditors by flying to the continent, where, at Boulogne, he died, January 6, 1834.

"Affairs do not seem to have much improved under his immediate successor. Perhaps the evil was already too deeply rooted to admit of cure. At all events, when, upon the death of Thomas Barnewall Martyn, Esq., M.P. of Ballinahinch Castle, the property descended to his daughter, popularly styled 'the Princess of Connemara,' she found it so incumbered by the prodigality of her ancestors, that it became a serious question in what way she was to keep her inheritance together. Still she struggled on bravely, and for some time maintained a decent appearance upon the balance that remained after paying off the interest of the various mortgages. A continuation in the same line of prudence might perhaps eventually have restored the family estates to something of their former splendour; but though sought in marriage by many of wealth and name, she gave her hand in preference to a near relative, Mr. Gonne Bell, who, whatever else might be his gifts, had not the gift of fortune. In this case, as in so many others, it was all for love, or the world well lost, a poetic creed, which is seldom very strongly believed in when the hey-day of life is over.

"On the day of marriage Mr. Gonne Bell assumed, by royal license, dated 15th September, 1847, the name of his bride, and shortly afterwards both parties united in borrowing a large sum of money from the *Law Life Assurance Company*, in order to consolidate the incumbrances upon the estate at a lower rate of interest. But this attempt to save themselves was defeated by events over which they had no control. The year of famine came on; government works were commenced, and the tenants soon ceased to pay any rents whatever, and as a natural consequence, the owners of so many thousand acres were no longer able to pay up the instalments due upon their mortgage. Men acting in large bodies are seldom so merciful as when they are individually responsible for their deeds, and the Law Life Assurance Society formed no exception to this rule of general experience. They insisted upon the due performance of the bond, and that being under the circumstances impossible, this vast Connemara property came into the Incumbered Estates Court, and the famous old race of Martin of Ballinahinch was sold out; the times were the worst possible for an advanta-

geous sale, and the Assurance Company bought in almost the entire of the estate, at a sum immeasurably below its real value, and quite inadequate, even with the produce of the remnant of the lands, bought by other parties, to the liquidation of its heavy liabilities. Not a single acre remained for the poor heiress of what was once a princely estate, and while others were then fattening upon her ancient inheritance, the 'Princess of Connemara,' without any fault of her own, became an absolute pauper. The home of her fathers had passed away to strangers, leaving nothing behind but debts and the bitter recollection of what she had lately been. A more painful example of family decadence will not easily be found, though the roll of such events, as I have already shown, is sufficiently extensive. In most cases the fall is more or less gradual, the downward course speeding on with each descendant. But here, although the worms of decay had been for some time eating and undermining what seemed, from its size, to be indestructible, yet its progress was almost too rapid for notice, and when the building fell it seemed to fall at once, sweeping everything before it.

"In this total wreck of all her fortunes the ill-starred 'Princess of Connemara' retired to Fontaine L'Evêque, in Belgium, where for a short time she supported herself by her pen; but so scanty were the means thus obtained that she at length resolved to abandon the Continent for America, hoping to find in the New World an ampler field for her exertions. Some friends of the family now came forward with a small subscription to enable her to carry out this object. Much it could not have been, for we find her embarking on the voyage in a sailing vessel, although she was far advanced in pregnancy. A premature confinement was the result in this den of misery, without medical attendant, without a nurse, without any one of the aids so indispensable at such a moment of danger and suffering. Can it be a matter of surprise to any one that she died soon after she touched the shore, or as some will have it, before she left the boat?

"With her has perished the last direct representative of her race, though even now the echo of their name has not passed away among the peasants. The people of Connemara yet speak of the Martins as being the legitimate lords of the soil, and never mention them but with affectionate regret.

"It only remains to add that this unfortunate lady has left behind her several works that prove her to have possessed more than the ordinary degree of accomplishments belonging even to her elevated condition. Of these the most popular are 'Canvassing,' which was published in connection with Banim's 'Mayor of Windgap,' and a work in three volumes, called 'St. Etienne.' She was also said to have been a good Greek and Latin scholar, and must certainly have been familiar with French, since she contributed to French periodicals during her residence in Belgium, but beyond all this she was kind-hearted and of a most independent character.

“ ‘Pride, bend thine eye from heaven to thine estate,
 See how the mighty sink into a song !
 Can volume, pillar, pile, preserve the great ?
 Or must thou trust tradition's tongue,
 When flatt'ry sleeps with thee and history does thee wrong ? ’ ”—
 pp. 65-73.

This, or something like this, is the story of families in every county in Ireland, who, up to the period of the famine, had gone on accumulating incumbrances from the date of the battle of the Boyne, and would have gone on until now at the same work, had not their career been stopped. While we should not envy those who would withhold their sympathy from individual suffering, it is impossible not to recognise the national benefit that has resulted from the diminution, (unfortunately it does not amount to the disappearance,) of the class in question. Sir Bernard Burke is indeed somewhat lavish of his sympathy, and we admit an occasional inability to understand it at all. He inquires, for instance, what story of fiction can be more striking than that of Mr. Darcy, of Kiltullagh, and Clifden castle, in the county of Galway, who, after the ruinous sale of his estates; took orders and became a missionary in the very district which had been once his own? What does Sir Bernard Burke understand by a missionary? From whom was the mission derived, and to whom was the missionary sent? Sydney Smith, a sufficiently sound Protestant, declared that the Protestant establishment in Ireland had no parallel even in Timbuctoo; and it does not appear that either Livingstone or Gordon Cumming met with anything at all resembling that institution on the banks of Lake Tchad. Still “orders,” as Sir Bernard is pleased to call them, are a profession in Ireland; and if a ruined proprietor think proper to resort to them, it is no discredit. A legal and conventional respectability attaches to the thing which there is no gainsaying; and in the spirit of Protestantism, it is much the same thing to say that a decayed gentleman takes orders, as to say that he becomes a physician or an attorney. But a missionary is quite a different thing. The term is strictly a relative one. In Ireland, the parson, although he is supposed “*personam gerere ecclesiæ*,” is not necessarily understood to represent that character for the benefit of any congregation in particular. But “missionary” is a word involving a threefold relation. It implies

one who has authority to send ; one who is sent, and men who require his ministrations. To read the passage in Sir Bernard Burke's book, to which we refer, the mission of Mr. Darcy might be as authentic as that of St. Patrick to the Irish, or of St. Francis Xavier to the Indians. St. Francis was a missionary, so is Mr. Darcy—the Indians were pagans, so were Mr. Darcy's tenants ; St. Francis was commissioned to convert the one, Mr. Hyacinth Darcy to convert the other. A gentleman in distress, may be forced to do strange things, and misery brings a man acquainted with strange bed-fellows. A gentleman, as Goldsmith says, may be obliged to dance a bear, and if he dance his bear to genteel tunes, he may keep his place ; but should he take to more questionable pursuits, he cannot pretend to much sympathy. Dionysius, a schoolmaster at Corinth, is still the king ; Dionysius, gambling in a fair, would be considerably below a common thimble-rigger. Mr. Darcy, as an attorney's clerk or station master on a railway, would be still a gentleman, and worthy of respect ; but when he connects himself with the "missionary" movement in Connaught, he may be abandoned to those who can respect him, and those who can respect him should be left to themselves. With regard to Sir Bernard Burke, however, we are quite sure that this inconsiderate sentence was thrown off without reflection, and that he no more regards Mr. Darcy as a missionary, than Mr. Eyre would admit his title to Clifden castle. We are not particularly well affected towards the Protestant, meaning, the Established clergy in general ; but we know as a fact, that many of them regard the missionary movement in its true light, that is to say, as a swindle, and a bubble. The bubble indeed has burst, but the swindle is alive.

There are thirty-two chapters in the entire work, and when we say that they comprise historical notices of most of the leading families in the United Kingdom, which have suffered the greatest reverses, it may be easily imagined that they furnish incidents and changes enough for romances without end. To mention only a few of the best known, we have notices of the Percys, Nevilles, Cromwells, the families that bore the title of Buckingham, the Stuarts, O'Neills, Maguires, Geraldines, and, strange to say, amongst British and Irish families, the Imperial Palæologi. The chapter upon heraldry is not without its own interest to the uninitiated, for whom it is intended,

and, indeed, it seems to contain all that it is desirable for them to know. In itself, the study is repelling, even if not ridiculous, to the general reader ; but if we consider that it is a study and a science, governed by regular rules, and not more obsolete, although less important than it was in the days of the crusades, it can never be wholly undeserving of attention. Its origin, or rather the idea from which it sprang, may be discovered, as many consider, in a very remote antiquity, and Sir Bernard Burke himself seems, by the motto at the head of his chapter, to go as far back for it as the days of Moses, or perhaps farther back still, for the passage from the book of Numbers, which he quotes, refers to standards and ensigns which had been in use antecedently. We have known other writers refer to a rather remarkable passage in the "Septem Contra Thebas," as a proof that heraldry was well understood in the days of Tydeus, or at all events in those of Aeschylus ; but the modern system of heraldry was perfected and reduced to a science at or shortly before the time of the crusades. We should not like to have to determine, whether it has done more harm or good, whether it has tended more to encourage empty pride, or to foster and preserve a sense of duty. If every one entitled to bear arms were governed by the fine adage "noblesse oblige ;" and if the mottos of families, so full of pure morality, were well observed, heraldry would be, past comparison, the most important study of the time ; but even though that is not so, it is worth while to learn at least as much of it as Sir Bernard Burke has very judiciously thought proper to communicate. The truth probably is that there is some value in heraldry notwithstanding its insufferable jargon, and the absurdities by which it is overlaid. It is not because it pampers the pride of the weak and the empty that it should serve no good purpose with men of a different stamp. There are certainly those who think that the more approved their nobility, the more severely noble, in the best sense, should be their life and manners ; and whatever be the influence of heraldry upon modern society, it is a science that does exist, and does exercise a real and sensible influence upon the men of these islands at all events. To the uninitiated, as Sir Bernard Burke calls the general public, nothing can appear more frivolous, absurd, or worn out, than the entire system ; and yet there is no institution of the day possess-

ing a fresher vitality than that of heraldry. Far be it from us to despise a science which cannot be seriously followed without inducing a knowledge of history, such as is rarely found in the times we live in, and which is at least as capable of encouraging nobility of sentiment and action as of feeding vanity and idleness. As a study it is not to our own taste, but we do not, therefore, think that it should be undervalued or neglected.

We now revert to some of the vicissitudes recorded by Sir Bernard, and amongst the most striking we select those of the great House of Neville.

"Bright as is the halo which Romance and Song have shed round the name of Percy, I question much whether any one of that illustrious race ever reached the pinnacle of power attained by Ralph Neville, the first Earl of Westmoreland, or by Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, 'the greatest and last of the old Norman chivalry—kinglier in pride, in state, in possessions, and in renown, than the king himself.' A recent writer remarks with much truth, that 'the Neville was to mediæval England what the Douglas was to Scotland.' No family surpassed it in the brilliancy of its alliances and honours, or in the vastness of its estates. Of the house of Neville there have been six Earls of Westmoreland, two Earls of Salisbury, one of whom, and the most renowned, was also Earl of Warwick, eighteen barons, and four Earls of Abergavenny, one Earl of Kent, two Marquisses of Montacute, one of whom was also Duke of Bedford, five barons Latimer, one Lord Furnival, and one Lord Fauconberg. The illustrious names that adorn the family tree of the Nevilles are numerous beyond all precedent. A Neville was queen of England and a Neville mother of two of our monarchs. Twice was a Neville consecrated Archbishop of York, and twice did a Neville fill the dignified office of Lord High Chancellor; seven Nevilles were duchesses, nine Neville's were Knights of the Garter, a Neville presided over the Commons as Speaker, and Nevilles without end pervade our national records as warriors and statesmen. The annual income in land of Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, independently of his own patrimony, would be calculated in our present money at full £300,000. Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton has vividly portrayed 'the Last of the Barons.' 'His wealth,' says the novelist, 'was enormous, but it was equalled by his magnificence, and rendered popular by his lavish hospitality. No less than thirty thousand persons are stated to have feasted daily at the open tables, with which he allured to his countless castles the strong hands and grateful hearts of our unsettled and martial population.'

"The genealogist will recollect that when Josceline de Louvaine received in marriage the heiress of the Percys, the proud condition

was imposed on the Flemish prince, on his accepting the Norman alliance, that he should relinquish either his own name or coat of arms in favour of that of his bride, and that he decided the option by assuming the name of Percy. Whether in performance of some similar agreement, or out of gratitude for their large maternal inheritance, or from the mere fashion of that day to Normanize, the descendants of Robert Fitz Maldred, the Saxon Lord of Raby, by Isabel Neville his wife, the Norman lady of Brancepeth assumed the surname of Neville. The vast estates thus united devolved in due course of time upon Robert Neville of Raby, who married Mary, daughter and sole heiress of Ralph Fitz Randolph, Lord of Middleham, and thus added the famous castle and estates of Middleham to his already overgrown possessions. The issue of this, if the narrative of contemporary historians be correct, unfortunate marriage, was Ralph de Neville, a noble baron, careless in the management of his affairs, and fonder of residing with the monks of Coverham and Marton than in his own castles. He married twice, and by his first wife Euphemia Clavinger, had two sons, on the elder of whom, Robert, called from his love of show and finery, 'the Peacock of the North,' his grandmother settled the castle and lordship of Middleham, with all its appendages in fee; but dying before his father, who survived until the year 1331, he was buried on the south side of the altar at Coverham, and was succeeded by his only brother, Ralph, Lord Neville of Raby, who, in the fifth year of Edward III., obtained a fresh charter of free warren in all his lands and lordships in the county of York. At one time he was ambassador to treat with Philip of Valois in the presence of the Pope, and on various occasions he was engaged in the French and Scottish wars. At length, having spent a long and active life, he died in 1341, and was buried in Durham cathedral, where his monument still remains, he having been the first layman who had sepulture there. His son and heir, John, third Lord Neville of Raby, who fought in Scotland, France, and Turkey, was such a gallant soldier, that John of Gaunt, in consideration of fifty marks a-year, charged on his estates in Danby and Forcett, Yorkshire, retained him in his service for life. By his first marriage with Maude, daughter of Lord Percy, he had Ralph, his heir; by his second union with Elizabeth, heiress of William Lord Latimer, he had John, subsequently Lord Latimer. John, third Lord Neville of Raby, died on St. Luke's day, anno. 12. Rich. II., and was interred near his father at Durham. His eldest son and successor, Ralph de Neville, having first won the golden spurs of knighthood, was, in the twenty-first year Rich. II., created Earl of Westmoreland, and subsequently received from Henry IV. a grant of the earldom of Richmond, (which title, however, he never assumed.) During the time of this the great Earl of Westmoreland, the power and grandeur of his race seems to have attained a very high degree of eminence. He was a Knight of the Garter, Warden of the West Marches, and Earl Marshal of England, and died pos-

sessed of the honours and castles of Richmond, Middleham, and Sheriff Hutton, with many a dependant manor and many a fair southern lordship. His eldest son, (by the Lady Margaret Stafford, his first wife, the daughter of Hugh, Earl of Stafford, K.G.,) John Lord Neville, who died before him, was the direct ancestor of Charles, sixth Earl of Westmoreland, whose miserable end we will by and by narrate. The eldest son of the second princely alliance of the first Earl of Westmoreland with Jean Beaufort, daughter of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, was Richard Neville, Lord of Middleham, who by his marriage with Alice, daughter and heiress of Thomas Montagu, Earl of Salisbury, acquired that title, and having joined the standard of Richard Plantaganet, Duke of York, who had married his sister, the Lady Cecilia Neville, was beheaded after the disastrous battle of Wakefield, A.D., 1460, when his estates became forfeited to the crown. But in the following year Edward IV. regained the throne of his ancestors, and Middleham castle, with all its vast domains and wide-spread manors, reverted to their rightful owner, the renowned 'king maker,' Richard Earl of Salisbury, K.G., and by his union with Anne, sole heiress of her brother, Duke of Warwick, Earl of Warwick also :—

‘For who lived king but he could dig his grave,
And who durst smile when Warwick bent his brow?’

“Under him the ancient fortress of Middleham seem to have reached the height of its magnificence, and within its walls he kept all but royal state. To quote the words of the gifted author of ‘the Last of the Barons,’ the most renowned statesmen, the mightiest lords flocked to his hall : Middleham, not Windsor, nor Westminster, nor Sheene, nor the Tower, seemed the court of England.’ Here it was that the Duke of Gloucester, his future son-in-law, learned the art of war from the princely earl. Here it was that the fourth Edward, conducted as a prisoner guest, by his gallant bearing and soul-stirring address, bowed the barons, knights, and retainers of his overgrown subject to his will. Here being left, as tradition states, under the surveillance of Warwick’s brother, the Archbishop of York, and being indulged with the privilege of hunting in the park, Edward escaped on a fleet horse and resumed the reins of government. But I must not dilate too much. That mighty earl, who had made and unmade kings, found a bloody grave at Barnet, and Middleham, with all its dependencies, was allotted to Richard Duke of Gloucester, in right of his wife, the Lady Anne Neville, Warwick’s youngest daughter.

“In 1469 the House of Neville attained the acmé of its glory. Within exactly one hundred years its ruin was accomplished. In 1569 Charles Neville, sixth Earl of Westmoreland, received at his castle of Brancepeth, his neighbour, the Earl of Northumberland, and there was concocted the ‘Rising of the North.’

' And now the inly-working North,
Was ripe to send its thousands forth,
A potent vassalage to fight
In Percy's and in Neville's right.'

"But the insurrection was ill-planned and rashly determined on. It resulted in total defeat, and in the utter destruction of the Nevilles of Raby. Lord Westmoreland fled to Scotland, and found protection and concealment for a long time at Ferryhurst Castle, Lord Kerr's house, in Roxburghshire. Meanwhile the Earl's cousin, Robert Constable, was hired by Sir Ralph Sadler to endeavour to track the unfortunate nobleman, and under the guise of friendship to betray him. Constable's correspondence appears among the Sadler State papers, an infamous memorial of treachery and baseness. Despite, however, the efforts of government, the Earl succeeded in effecting his escape to Flanders: but his vast inheritance was confiscated, and he suffered the extremes of poverty. Brancepeth, the stronghold of the Nevilles in war, and Raby, their festive hall in peace, had passed into strangers' hands, and nothing remained for the exiled lord. He was living in the Low Countries, in 1572, on a miserable pittance allowed him by the bounty of the King of Spain, and so deplorable had been his previous condition, that Lord Seton, writing two years before to Mary, Queen of Scots, states that the Earl of Westmoreland had neither penny nor half-penny. The petition to the Spanish monarch which obtained this trifling provision, gives a pathetic description of this nobleman's wretchedness, and sets forth that the estates of which he had been deprived were worth 400,000 doubloons per annum, that is, £150,000 of our money. His Lordship survived his flight from Scotland more than thirty years, eking out a wretched existence, and dying penniless and almost forgotten in Flanders, in 1601. By his high spirited and devoted wife, the Lady Jane Howard, the worthy daughter of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, he left four children, viz., Catherine, married to Sir Thomas Grey, of Chillingham; Elizabeth, who died unmarried; Margaret, married to Sir Nicholas Pudsey; and Anne, married to David Ingleby, of Ripley. Pecuniary pressure and severe suffering were the lot of those ladies; the third, Margaret, endured persecution and oppression. There is a letter from Hutton, Bishop of Durham, to Lord Burghley, dated 1594, suing for Lady Margaret's pardon, wherein he says:— 'I sent up in the beginning of the term to sue for the pardon of the Ladye Margaret Neville, taken in company with Boast, the seminary priest. She lamented with tears that she hath offended God and her Sovereign: she is wholly reclaimed from Popery. Dr. Aubrey hath had her pardon drawn since the beginning of the term. If it come not quickly I fear she will die with sorrow. It were very honourable for your good Lordship to take the case of a most distressed mayden, descended as your Lordship knoweth,

of great nobilitie, the House of Norfolk, the House of Westmoreland, and the House of Rutland, in memory of man, and was but a child of five years old when her father did enter into the rebellion ; and now she is a condemned person, having not one penny by year to live upon since the death of her mother, who gave her £33 6s. 8d. a year, part of that £300 which her majesty did allow her. It were well that her Majesty were informed of her miserable state. She is virtuously given, humble, modest, and of very good behaviour.'

"Thus tragically closed the last act of the eventful drama of the Nevilles of Raby. The Bishop of Durham's supplicating letter on behalf of the 'distressed Maiden' is indeed a sad end to the mightiest and noblest race in our English Annals. What a different scene does the Bishop's petition disclose, from the gorgeous display of power and wealth of the preceding century ! The crowds of retainers had dispersed. The castles are dismantled and the broad lands parcelled out amongst strangers. In their stead, a poor desolate lady, dwelling in a lonely residence, in a foreign land, and suing for some small pittance to stave off actual want.

" As highest hills with tempests be most touched,
And tops of trees most subject unto winds,
And as great towers with stones strongly couched
Have heavy falls when they be undermined ;
E'en so by proof in worldly things we finde,
That such as climb the top of high degree,
From perill of falling never can be free."

' Not the least curious story in the collection is that of the last of the Palæologi. Theodore, the direct descendant of Thomas, the second brother of Constantine Palæologus, the last Greek emperor, is traced to Clifton, near the village of Landulph, whither he had retired from Pesaro in Italy. At Clifton he married into an English family, and had issue five children, three sons and two daughters. One son died without issue, the second fell at Naseby, fighting under the standard of the king, and the third, who fought upon the same side, escaped with life and fled to Jamaica, where he died in the year 1678, leaving an only son, Theodore, who died young and unmarried. Of the daughters one died unmarried at Clifton, and the other married into the Arundell family, and died in the year 1681. During the war of independence the Greek provisional government appointed a deputation to proceed to England and other countries to ascertain whether any of the Palæologi still existed. The deputation proceeded to

Landulph and elsewhere, but no male descendant of the Palæologi could be found. The name of Palæologus alone would doubtless have influenced in no small degree the destinies of the future kingdom of Greece, and contributed to redeem it from the contempt into which it has fallen, quite as much through the vices of its government as through those of its inhabitants; but the Palæologi owed to the Christian world a signal atonement for the crimes and follies of their rule, and the penalty of their atonement seems to have been exacted to the utmost.

The stories of the vicissitudes of Irish families, Norman and Milesian, which we find in Sir Bernard Burke's book, are full and interesting. They include accounts of the families of O'Neill, MacCarthy, Maguire of Tempo, and Desmond. The chapter upon the Geraldines is in the nature of a review of Lord Kildare's memoir of his family. The recollections of English counties embodied in one of the essays, are such as could hardly fail to occur to any one so familiar with all their features as is Sir Bernard Burke, and so well acquainted with their records. The entire work, although without pretensions to style, is everywhere readable and pleasing. The profusion of his materials must have been the author's chief embarrassment, and in our humble judgment he has exercised a sound discretion in the choice of those which have been presented to the reader. With a very natural attachment to his own science, Sir Bernard has entered pretty much at large into the nature and importance of the office which he himself fills. We can only say that while it is so gracefully filled as at present, and with such profit to the reading public, we hope it may long remain in honour, and long be represented by so worthy a king as the King at Arms now happily reigning.

ART. VII.—*History of Frederick II. of Prussia, called Frederick the Great*. By Thomas Carlyle. In four Volumes. Vols. i—ii. London: Chapman and Hall, 1858.

MR. CARLYLE'S "Frederick the Great" is a gigantic monument of that Hero-worship the science of which Mr. Carlyle himself was almost the first to develop and systematize. The readers of most of Mr. Carlyle's biographical sketches, and especially of his "Cromwell," will have been prepared to find "Frederick the Great" partake largely of that character; but we doubt whether even the "Cromwell" itself, with all its passionate and fitful idolatry, will bear any comparison with the calm, deliberate, and sustained purpose which pervades the ponderous volumes which Mr. Carlyle has devoted to his Prussian hero. Of these volumes but two are as yet before us, nor, of course, is it safe at present to pronounce positively as to the character of the entire work: but from the magnitude of the porch we may be permitted to infer the intended proportions and splendour of the temple. The two volumes which have appeared, and which extend to nearly fourteen hundred pages, conduct the history of Frederick only as far as the death of his father and his own assumption of the royal authority; and even of these two, as they may be called, introductory volumes, fully one-third is given to a preliminary survey of the origin and historical vicissitudes of the hereditary domain of Brandenburg, the scene of the life and exploits of Mr. Carlyle's hero.

The portion of Mr. Carlyle's "Frederick the Great" now published is, in truth, little more than the salaam with which this enthusiastic worshipper approaches the throne of his idol. Like the eastern priest, humbly touching with his forehead the threshold of the outermost court which leads towards the approach to the shrine of the god, Mr. Carlyle thinks it his duty to bow down before the first shadowy representative of Brandenburg and Hohenzollern that he finds flitting across the misty field of earliest German history; nor does he cease his reverent ministrations till he has penetrated to the very inmost shrine, which he has himself helped to furnish forth for the worship of his modern hero.

Perhaps, indeed, it would be more correct to say

that the first and second volumes of this biography are the biography of Frederick William, the father of Frederick the Great. It is true that the latter is frequently alluded to, even from the very earliest stages of his childhood : but throughout the entire narrative which precedes Frederick's actual accession to power, his father is Mr. Carlyle's principal, and, absurd as it may seem, one sometimes can hardly help suspecting, his favourite, character ; for, with all the occasional ridicule which he bestows upon his strange and fantastical peculiarities, it is plain that Mr. Carlyle regards Frederick William as one of those characters in history to whom he looks as redeeming the truth, integrity, and what he emphatically calls manhood, of their generation.

There is no doubt a certain point up to which this course of preparatory foreshadowing of the coming man is not only permissible but even advantageous. The actual condition of the hereditary dominions of Frederick could hardly have been understood without a concise sketch of their earlier fortunes and history. It would be difficult rightly to appreciate his personal character without understanding not merely the training to which he had been submitted, but even the dispositions, the habits, and the whole physical and moral constitution of those among whom he had lived, and by whom his own peculiarities must have been even directly influenced. In this respect the life of his father is of great importance towards a correct reading of his own. It seldom happens that the characteristics of one generation are faithfully perpetuated in the next one, but even the contrast, which not unfrequently is found, has its own value in enabling us to interpret what might otherwise seem contradictions and anomalies. Still there are limits to the use of these aids to the interpretation of character, and certainly the blindest of Mr. Carlyle's admirers must feel that he has far outstepped them in the monster introduction with which he ushers in the career of his hero.

Mr. Carlyle's survey of early German history, or rather of the original relations of Brandenburg and Hohenzollern to the history of the German Empire, and as such to the general history of Europe, is undoubtedly a work of great ability, and the fruit of an amount of ponderous and uncommon reading to which few outside of Germany itself would have thought of addressing themselves. But we cannot con-

gratulate either himself or the historical world on its result. It will strike most readers as being at once, strange as the union may appear, both superficial and profound; and, while it combines the evil qualities of both these characteristics, it wants, on the one hand, the light and easy grace of a popular essay, and on the other the solid comprehensiveness of learned dissertation, exhausting all the sources of information, and presenting in outline all the striking facts of the subject. Mr. Carlyle's sketch of German history supposes in the reader at once too much and too little. In the fulness of his own familiarity with the subject, he presumes on a degree of knowledge of German history in his readers which is entirely beyond the average of the historical attainments common even in the educated classes of Englishmen. In this manner he passes over in his narrative, or at least alludes but in terms which scarcely convey a distinct idea to the uninitiated, to many facts and even periods which for most readers are absolutely necessary to the completeness of the chain of history. Even those on which he dwells, or which he puts more prominently forward, are selected on a theory peculiarly his own, and being thus selected, are marshalled so as to realize the ruling idea of that theory. It must never be forgotten that the lesson which Mr. Carlyle looks for in history is entirely different from that which ordinary students of history have been accustomed to learn. For all professional historians, whom he flouts as mere *Dryasdusts*, he entertains a sovereign contempt. He professes to believe, in so far as his creed can be gathered from the strange jargon in which it is formalized, that *the poet*—that is the real poet, in the sense in which Homer and Shakspeare were poets—is the only true historian;—that “the highest Shakspeare producible is properly the fittest Historian producible.” Hence he considers it “frightful to see the *Gelehrte Dummkopf*” (what we here may translate, *Dryasdust*) “doing the function of History, and the Shakspeare and the Goethe neglecting it. ‘Interpreting events;’ interpreting the universally visible, entirely indubitable Revelation of the Author of this Universe.” “How,” he asks, “can Dryasdust interpret such things, the dark chaotic dullard, who knows the meaning of nothing cosmic or noble, nor ever will know? Poor wretch, one sees what kind of meaning *he* educes from Man's History, this long while past, and

has got all the world to believe of it along with him. Unhappy Dryasdust, thrice unhappy world that takes Dryasdust's reading of the ways of God! But what else was possible? They that could have taught better were engaged in fiddling; for which there are good wages going. And our damage therefrom, our *damage*,—yes, if thou be still human and not cormorant,—perhaps it will transcend all Californias, English National Debts, and show itself incomputable in continents of Bullion!—” Believing, nevertheless, that mankind are not doomed wholly to doglike annihilation, Mr. Carlyle believes that much of this will mend. He believes that the world “will not always waste its inspired men in mere fiddling to it. That the man of rhythmic nature will feel more and more his vocation towards the Interpretation of Fact; since only in the vital centre of that, could we once get thither, lies all real melody; and that he will become once again the Historian of Events,—bewildered Dryasdust having at last the happiness to be his servant, and to have some guidance from him.” This, he adds, will be blessed indeed. For the present, Dryasdust strikes him like “a hapless Nigger gone masterless: Nigger totally unfit for self-guidance; yet without master good or bad; and whose feats in that capacity no god or man can rejoice in. History, with faithful Genius at the top and faithful Industry at the bottom, will then be capable of being written. History will then actually *be* written,—the inspired gift of God employing itself to illuminate the dark ways of God. A thing thrice pressingly needful to be done! Whereby the modern Nations may again become a little less godless, and again have their ‘epics’ (of a different from the Schiller sort) and again have several things they are still more fatally in want of at present!—”

Anticipating this happy time, he concludes that “if Friedrich last some centuries, there will be a real Epic made of his History. That is to say, (presumably), it will become a perfected Melodious Truth, and duly significant and duly beautiful bit of Belief, to mankind; the essence of it fairly evolved from all the chaff, the portrait of it actually given, and its real harmonies with the laws of this Universe brought out, in bright and dark, according to the God's Fact as it *was*; which poor Dryasdust

and the Newspapers could never get sight of, but were always far from !"—Vol. i. pp. 23-24.

Since this is Mr. Carlyle's idea of the function of a historian of Frederick, it is easy to infer what are his views as to the lights to be gathered in the preliminary survey of the history of Germany, for the purpose of illustrating the biography which he has in hand. He reads it, in truth, but as a lesson in the great science of Humanitarianism—an illustration of the aims, the struggles, the successes, and the failures of that one great principle in this universe of ours, which is Mr. Carlyle's, and it alone concerns us to study—Manhood. For this he finds, or thinks he finds, abundant materials in Frederick. "There is one feature," he says, "which strikes you at an early period of the inquiry, That in his way he is a Reality; that he always means what he speaks; grounds his actions, too, on what he recognises for the truth; and, in short, has nothing whatever of the Hypocrite or Phantasm. Which some readers will admit to be an extremely rare phenomenon. We perceive that this man was far indeed from trying to deal swindler-like with the facts around him; that he honestly recognized said facts wherever they disclosed themselves, and was very anxious also to ascertain their existence where still hidden or dubious. For he knew well, to a quite uncommon degree, and with a merit all the higher as it was an unconscious one, how entirely inexorable is the nature of facts, whether recognized or not, ascertained or not; how vain all cunning of diplomacy, management and sophistry, to save any mortal who does *not* stand on the truth of things, from sinking in the long run. Sinking to the very Mudgods, with all his diplomacies, possessions, achievements; and becoming an unnameable object, hidden deep in the Cesspools of the Universe."

This it is that Mr. Carlyle hopes to make manifest; this which he long ago discerned for himself, with pleasure, in the physiognomy of Friedrich and his life; which indeed was the first real sanction, and has all along been his inducement and encouragement, to study his life and him:—"how this man, officially a King withal, comported himself in the Eighteenth Century, and managed *not* to be a Liar and Charlatan as his Century was, deserves to be seen a little by men and kings, and may silently have didactic meanings in it."—Vol. i. p. 18.

And hence it is that, for the most part, Mr. Carlyle, in his rapid survey of mediæval history, has simply selected those personages or events, which, in his own phrase, "are memorable" to him—which seem to him to deserve commemoration, as illustrating the great Epic of human history. Small space has he given to many a ponderous story, upon which the ordinary historians of the *Dummkopf* or Dryasdust school have devoted columns; and even those which he relates are told in that half-mocking half-moralizing strain, which, as in his *French Revolution*, leaves the reader uncertain how much of what he reads is put down as fact, how much has sprung from the grotesque fancy of the writer.

Mr. Carlyle's style, too, in these remarkable volumes, maintains, or indeed we should say, exhibits in exaggerated forms all those quaint extravagancies which have come naturally, though perhaps unjustly, to be regarded as its distinguishing characteristics. We find even in the most serious portions of his narrative, a stormy period of history described as a "Donnybrook;" the Council of Constance is "a wind-egg;" we hear of "devil's dances," "bacon-and-greens-consciences," "tobacco-parliaments," and a thousand similar grotesque buffooneries of designation, infinitely more out of place in what professes to be a serious history than they have hitherto been felt to be in the more fugitive productions of the author.

We are tempted to give a few specimens of the strange manner in which he has treated some of those curious episodes in early German history, which, with singular capriciousness as to time, order, and other conventionalities, he has selected for a place in his historical introduction.

The *Teutsche Ritter*, or Teutonic Knights, as the reader recollects, bear an important part in the early civilization and the religious and social organization of Prussia. Mr. Carlyle devotes a few sections to them. After relating how, from the time when St. Adalbert was massacred in Prussia, "stamping himself as a Crucifix on that heathen soil," efforts, for the most part unavailing, had been made for the conversion of the inhabitants; the work at once of conversion, of colonization, and of conquest, was assigned to the *Teutsche Ritters*. The passage will exemplify more than one of Mr. Carlyle's peculiarities.

"The Prussians were a fierce fighting people, fanatically Anti-Christian: the Teutsch Ritters had a perilous never-resting time of it, especially for the first fifty years. They built and burnt innumerable stockades for and against; built wooden Forts which are now stone Towns. They fought much and prevalently; galloped desperately to and fro, ever on the alert. In peaceabler ulterior times, they fenced in the Nogat and the Weichsel with dams, whereby unlimited quagmire might become grassy meadow,—as it continues to this day. Marienburg (*Mary's Burg*), still a Town of importance in that same grassy region, with its grand stone Schloss still visible and even habitable; this was at length their Head quarter. But how many Burgs of wood and stone they built, in different parts; what revolts, surprisals, furious fights in woody boggy places, they had, no man has counted. Their life, read in Dryasdust's newest chaotic Books (which are of endless length, among other ill qualities), is like a dim nightmare of unintelligible marching and fighting: one feels as if the mere amount of galloping they had would have carried the Order several times round the Globe. What multiple of the Equator was it then, O Dryasdust! the Herr Professor, little studious of abridgment, does not say?

"But always some preaching, by zealous monks, accompanied the chivalrous fighting. And colonists came in from Germany; trickling in, or at times streaming. Victorious Ritterdom offers terms to the beaten Heathen; terms not of tolerant nature, but which will be punctually kept by Ritterdom. When the flame of revolt or general conspiracy burnt up again too extensively, there was a new Crusade proclaimed in Germany and Christendom; and the Hochmeister, at Marburg or elsewhere, and all his marshals and ministers were busy,—generally with effect. High personages came on crusade to them. Ottocar, King of Bohemia, Duke of Austria and much else, the great man of his day, came once (A. D. 1255); Johann King of Bohemia, in the next century, once and again. The mighty Ottocar, with his extensive far-shining chivalry, 'conquered Samland in a month;' tore up the Romova where Adalbert had been massacred, and burnt it from the face of the Earth. A certain Fortress was founded at that time, in Ottocar's presence; and in honour of him they named it *King's Fortress*, 'Königsberg:' it is now grown a big-domed metropolitan City,—where we of this Narrative lately saw a Coronation going on, and Sophie Charlotte furtively taking a pinch of snuff. Among King Ottocar's esquires or subaltern junior officials on this occasion, is one *Rudolf*, heir of a poor Swiss Lordship and gray Hill Castle, called *Hapsburg*, rather in reduced circumstances, whom Ottocar likes for his prudent hardy ways; a stout, modest, wise young man,—who may chance to redeem Hapsburg a little if he live! How the shuttles fly, and the life-threads, always, in this 'loud-roaring loom of Time!'

"Along with Ottocar, too, as an ally in the Crusade, was Otto

III. Ascanier Markgraf and Elector of Brandenburg, great-grandson of Albert the Bear ;—named *Otto the Pious* in consequence. He too founded a Town in Prussia, on this occasion, and called it *Brandenburg*; which is still extant there, a small Brandenburg the Second : for these procedures he is called *Otto the Pious* in History. His Wife, withal, was a sister of Ottocar's;—which, except in the way of domestic felicity, did not in the end amount to much for him ; this Ottocar having flown too high, and melted his wings at the sun, in a sad way, as we shall see elsewhere.”—Vol. i. pp. 115-17.

This was at least a reality. So long as man is working, no matter what the work may be, Mr. Carlyle's theory is satisfied.

“None of the Orders rose so high as the Teutonic in favour with mankind. It had by degrees landed possessions far and wide over Germany and beyond : I know not how many dozens of *Balleys* (rich Bailliwicks, each again with its dozens of *Comthureis*, Commanderies, or subordinate groups of estates), and Baillies and Commanders to match;—and was thought to deserve favour from above. Valiant servants, these ; to whom heaven had vouchsafed great labours and unspeakable blessings. In some fifty or fifty-three years they had got Prussian Heathenism brought to the ground ; and they endeavoured to tie it well down there by bargain and arrangement. But it would not yet lie quiet, nor for a century to come ; being still secretly Heathen ; revolting, conspiring ever again, ever on weaker terms, till the Satanic element had burnt itself out, and conversion and composure could ensue.

“Conversion and complete conquest once come, there was a happy time for Prussia : ploughshare instead of sword ; busy seahavens, German towns, getting built ; churches everywhere rising ; grass growing, and peaceable cows, where formerly had been quagmire and snakes. And for the Order a happy time ? A rich, not a happy. The Order was victorious ; Livonian ‘Sword-Brothers,’ ‘Knights of Dobryn,’ minor Orders and Authorities all round, were long since subordinated to it or incorporated with it ; Livonia, Courland, Lithuania, are all got tamed under its influence, or tied down and evidently tameable. But it was in these times that the Order got into its wider troubles outward and inward ; quarrels, jealousies, with Christian neighbours, Poland, Pommern, who did not love it and for cause ;—wider troubles, and by no means so evidently useful to mankind. The Order's wages, in this world, flowed higher than ever, only perhaps its work was beginning to run low ! But we will not anticipate.”—Vol. i. pp. 117-18.

And yet his estimate of the *Teutsch Ritters*, and of their work, is higher than that of many more solemn historians, even though it is less reverently expressed.

"On the whole, this Teutsch Ritterdom, for the first century and more, was a grand phenomenon ; and flamed like a bright blessed beacon through the night of things, in those Northern Countries. For above a century, we perceive, it was the rallying-place of all brave men who had a career to seek on terms other than vulgar. The noble soul, aiming beyond money, and sensible to more than hunger in this world, had a beacon burning (as we say), if the night chanced to overtake it, and the earth to grow too intricate, as is not uncommon. Better than the career of stump-oratory, I should fancy, and *its* Hesperides Apples, golden and of gilt horse-dung. Better than puddling away one's poor spiritual gift of God (*loan*, not gift), such as it may be, in building the lofty rhyme, the lofty-Review-article, for a discerning public that has sixpence to spare! Times alter greatly."—Vol. i. pp. 118-19.

The celebrated story of "The False Waldemar," reads curiously in Mr. Carlyle's quaint pages. He relates it as one of the devices employed by the rivals of the young Lewis, Elector of Brandenburg, son of the Emperor Lewis the Bavarian.

"The wickedest and worst trouble of their raising was that of the resuscitated Waldemar (A.D. 1345); 'False Waldemar,' as he is now called in Brandenburg Books. Waldemar was the last, or as good as the last, of the Ascanian Markgraves ; and he, two years before Ludwig ever saw those countries, died in his bed, twenty-five good years ago ; and was buried, and seemingly ended. But no ; after twenty-five years, Waldemar re-appears : 'Not buried or dead, only sham-buried, sham dead ; have been in the Holy Land all this while doing pilgrimage and penance ; and am come to claim my own again.—which strangers are much misusing!'

"Perkin Warbeck, *Post-mortem* Richard II., Dimitri of Russia, Martin Guerre of the *Causes Célèbres* : it is a common story in the world, and needs no commentary now. *Post-mortem* Waldemar, it is said, was a Miller's Man, 'of the name of Jakob Rehback ;' who used to be about the real Waldemar in a menial capacity, and had some resemblance to him. He showed signets, recounted experiences, which had belonged to the real Waldemar. Many believed in his pretension, and took arms to assert it ; the Reich being in much internal battle at the time ; poor Kaiser Ludwig, with his Avignon Popes and angry Kings Johann, wading in deep waters. Especially the disaffected Cousinry, or Princes of Anhalt, believed and battled for *Post-mortem* Waldemar ; who were thought to have got him up from the first. Kurfürst Ludwig had four or five most sad years with him ;—all the worse when the *Pfaffen-Kaiser* (King Johann's son) came on the stage, in the course of them (A. D. 1346), and Kaiser Ludwig, yielding not indeed to him, but to Death, vanished from it two years after ; leaving Kurfürst Ludwig to his

own shifts with the Pfaffen-Kaiser. Whom he could not now hinder from succeeding to the Reich. He tried hard ; set up, he and others, an Anti-Kaiser (*Günther of Schwartzburg*, temporary Anti-Kaiser, whom English readers can forget again) : he hustled, battled, negotiated, up and down ; and ran across, at one time, to Preussen to the Teutsch Ritters,—presumably to borrow money :—but it all would not do. The Pfaffen-Kaiser carried it, in the Diet and out of the Diet : Karl IV. by title ; a sorry enough Kaiser, and by nature an enemy of Ludwig's.

"It was in this whirl of intricate misventures that Kurfürst Ludwig had to deal with his False Waldemar, conjured from the deeps upon him, like a new goblin, where already there were plenty, in the dance round poor Ludwig. Of which nearly inextricable goblin-dance—threatening Brandenburg, for one thing, with annihilation, and yet leading Brandenburg abstrusely towards new birth and higher destinies,—how will it be possible (without raising new ghosts, in a sense) to give readers any intelligible notion ?—Here, flickering on the edge of conflagration after duty done, is a poor Note which perhaps the reader had better, at the risk of superfluity, still in part take along with him :

"Kaiser Henry VII., who died of sacramental wine, First of the Luxemburg Kaisers, left Johann still a Boy of fifteen, who could not become the second of them, but did in time produce the Second, who again produced the Third and Fourth.

"Johann was already King of Bohemia ; the important young gentleman, Ottocar's grandson, whom we saw 'murdered at Olmütz none yet knows by whom,' had left that throne vacant, and it lapsed to the Kaiser ; who, the Nation also favouring, duly put in his son Johann. There was a competitor, 'Duke of the Tyrol,' who claimed on loose grounds ; 'my wife was Aunt of the young murdered King,' said he ; 'wherefore'—!—Kaiser, and Johann after him, rebutted this competitor ; but he long gave some trouble, having great wealth and means. He produced a Daughter, Margaret Heiress of the Tyrol,—with a terrible *mouth* to her face, and none of the gentlest hearts in her body :—that was perhaps his principal feat in the world. He died 1331 ; had styled himself 'King of Bohemia' for twenty years,—ever since 1308 ;—but in the last two years of his life he gave it up, and ceased from troubling, having come to a beautiful agreement with Johann.

"Johann, namely, wedded his eldest Son to this competitor's fine Daughter with the mouth (Year 1329) : 'In this manner do not Bohemia and the Tyrol come together in my blood and in yours, and both of us are made men ?' said the two contracting parties.—Alas, no : the competitor Duke, father of the Bride, died some two years after, probably with diminished hopes of it ; and King Johann lived to see the hope expire dismally altogether. There came no children, there came no—In fact Margaret, after a dozen years of wedlock, in unpleasant circumstances, broke it off as if by explo-

sion ; took herself and her Tyrol irrevocably over to Kaiser Ludwig, quite away from King Johann,—who, his hopes of the Tyrol expiring in such dismal manner, was thenceforth the bitter enemy of Ludwig and what held of him.”—Vol. i. pp. 160-62.

Here, again, is his sketch of the heiress of the Tyrol, Margaret Maultasche, “Margaret of the Pouch-Mouth.”

“What principally raised this dance of the devils round poor Ludwig, I perceive, was a marriage he had made, three years before Waldemar emerged ; of which, were it only for sake of the Bride’s name, some mention is permissible. Margaret of the Tyrol, commonly called, by contemporaries and posterity, *Maultasche* (Mouth-poke, Pocket-mouth), she was the bride ;—marriage done at Innspruck, 1342, under furtherance of father Ludwig the Kaiser :—such a mouth as we can fancy, and a character corresponding to it. This, which seemed to the two Ludwigs a very conquest of the golden fleece under conditions, proved the beginning of their worst days to both of them.

“Not a lovely bride at all, this Maultasche ; who is verging now towards middle life withal, and has had enough to cross her in the world. Was already married thirteen years ago ! not wisely nor by any means too well. A terrible dragon of a woman. Has been in nameless domestic quarrels ; in wars and sieges with rebellious vassals ; claps you an iron cap on her head, and takes the field when need is : furious she-bear of the Tyrol. But she has immense possessions, if wanting in female charms. She came by mothers from that Duke of Meran whom we saw get his death (for cause), in the Plassenburg a hundred years ago. Her ancestor was Husband to an Aunt of that homicided Duke : from him, principally from him, she inherits the Tyrol, Carinthia, Styria ; is herself an only child, the last of a line : hugest Heiress now going. So that, in spite of the mouth and humour, she has not wanted for wooers,—especially prudent Fathers wooing her for their sons.

“In her Father’s lifetime, Johann King of Bohemia, always awake to such symptoms of things, and having very peculiar interests in this case, courted and got her for his Crown-Prince (as we just saw), a youth of great outlooks, outlooks towards Kaisership itself perhaps ; to whom she was wedded, thirteen years ago, and duly brought the Tyrol for Heritage : but with the worst results. Heritage, namely, could not be had without strife with Austria, which likewise had claims. Far worse, the marriage itself went awry : Johann’s Crown-Prince was ‘a soft-natured Herr,’ say the Books : why bring your big she-bear into a poor deer’s den ? Enough, the marriage came to nothing, except to huge brawlings far enough away from us ; and Margaret Pouch-mouth has now divorced her Bohemian Crown-Prince as a Nullity ; and again

weds, on similar terms, Kaiser Ludwig's son, our Brandenburg Kurfürst,—who hopes possibly that *he* now may succeed as Kaiser, on the strength of his Father and of the Tyrol. Which turned out far otherwise.

“The marriage was done in the Church of Innspruck, 10th February 1342 (for we love to be particular), ‘Kaiser Ludwig,’ happy man, ‘and many Princes of the Empire, looking on ;’ little thinking what a coil it would prove. ‘At the high altar she stript off her veil’ (symbol of wifehood or widowhood), ‘and put on a *jungfernkranz* (maiden’s-garland),’ symbolically testifying how happy Ludwig junior still was. They had a son by and by ; but their course otherwise, and indeed this-wise too, was much chequered.

“King Johann, seeing the Tyrol gone in this manner, gloomed terribly upon his Crown-Prince ; flung him aside as a Nullity, ‘Go to Moravia, out of sight, on an apanage, you ; be Crown-Prince no longer!’—And took to fighting Kaiser Ludwig ; col-leagued diligently with the hostile Pope, with the king of France ; intrigued and col-leagued far and wide ; swearing by every method, everlasting enmity to Kaiser Ludwig ;—and set up his son Karl as Pfaffen-Kaiser. Nay, perhaps he was at the bottom of *Post-obit* Waldemar too. In brief, he raised, he mainly, this devil’s-dance, in which, Kaiser Ludwig having died, poor Kurfürst Ludwig, with Maultasche hanging on him, is sometimes near his wits’ end.

“Johann’s poor Crown-Prince, finding matters take this turn, retired into *Mähren* (Moravia) as bidden ; ‘Margrave of Mähren ;’ and peaceably adjusted himself to his character of Nullity and to the loss of Maultasche ;—chose, for the rest, a new Princess in wedlock, with more moderate dimensions of mouth ; and did produce sons and daughters on a fresh score. Produced, among others, one Jobst, his successor in the apanage or Margrafdom ; who as *Jobst*, or Jodocus, of *Mähren*, made some noise for himself in the next generation, and will turn up again in reference to Brandenburg in this History.

“As for Margaret Pouch-mouth, she, with her new Husband as with her old, continued to have troubles, pretty much as the sparks fly upwards. She had fierce siegings after this, and explosive procedures,—little short of Monk Schwartz, who was just inventing gunpowder at the time. We cannot hope she lived in Elysian harmony with Kurfürst Ludwig ;—the reverse in fact ; and oftenest with the whole breadth of Germany between them, he in Brandenburg, she in the Tyrol. Nor did Ludwig junior ever come to be Kaiser, as his Father and she had hoped ; on the contrary, King Johann of Bohemia’s people,—it was they that next got the Kaiser-ship and kept it ; a new provocation to Maultasche.

“Ludwig and she had a son, as we said ; Prince of the Tyrol and appendages, titular Margraf of Mähren and much else, by nature : but alas, he died about ten ; a precocious boy,—fancy the wild weeping of a maternal She-bear ! And the Father had already

died ; a malicious world whispering that perhaps she poisoned them both. The proud woman, now old too, pursed her big coarse lips together at such rumour, and her big coarse soul,—in a gloomy scorn appealing beyond the world ; in a sorrow that the world knew not of. She solemnly settled her Tyrol and appendages upon the Austrian Archdukes, who were children of her Mother's Sister ; whom she even installed into the actual government, to make matters surer. This done, she retired to Vienna, on a pension from them, there to meditate and pray a little, before Death came ; as it did now in a short year or two. Tyrol and the appendages continue with Austria from that hour to this, Margaret's little boy having died."—Vol. i. pp. 162 66.

It may perhaps illustrate what we have said of Mr. Carlyle's views of the truths to be learned from history, that his "rugged dragoon major of a woman, with an occasional steel cap on her head, and capable of swearing terribly in Flanders and elsewhere, remains in some measure memorable" to him. It is true he writes of her chiefly as "compared with Pompadour, Duchess of Cleveland, of Kendal, and other high-rouged unfortunate females, whom it is not proper to speak of without necessity, though it is often done," when he declares that, in his eyes, she "rises to the Historical ;" yet it is noticeable that the qualities which he admires in her are precisely those which, in another order and in a different degree, form for him the grand elements of the character of his Danton, and still more his "man of men," Mirabeau. "Moralities not a few must shriek condemnation" over Maultasche, as they must also "over Mirabeau." The morality by which they, in common with all Mr. Carlyle's heroes and heroines, must be judged, "has not got uttered by the mouth of men." But in both he recognizes the same great fact which claimed his admiring worship in Mirabeau, that he was "a reality, and no Simulacrum ;—a living son of Nature, our general author ; not a hollow artifice and mechanism of conventionalities ;—son of nothing, brother to nothing."*

From what we have said it will be inferred that the preliminary portion of the *Life of Frederick* throws little new light on the history of the period which it professes to survey. It seems to us a capricious and fantastical patch-

* French Revolution, ii. p. 200.

work of historical scraps selected according to the whim of the writer, and wrought together, mainly, it is true, with a view to the illustration of his own peculiar views, but in great measure also, we can hardly help thinking, for their grotesqueness and startling effect, and often for the purpose of outraging the rules and established proprieties of the professional historians—"dreary" chroniclers such as "windy Pöllnitz," "abstruse historical Fassmann," and the hundred other "inarticulate," "surprising," "distracted" Dryasdusts of German history. What forms, indeed, for ordinary minds, the staple of German history is in his eyes as nothing. He never once adverts to the great struggle of Church and State on investitures. The whole history of the great Council of Constance is to him "zero, plus the burning of Huss." Even the Reformation receives but a very passing notice, and he never even alludes to the long quarrel of the Interim. He passes over the Thirty Years' war in a few scoffing paragraphs. And when he does treat really important historical questions, such as, for example, the vital question in Prussian history, of Grand-Master Albert's apostasy, and appropriation to himself and his successors of the territorial possessions of the order, which he held but as a trustee, he undertakes to settle it all by his own sweeping *ipse dixit*, unsupported by a single argument or authority. After having stated in a very loose and partial way the minor facts of the case, as seen from his own characteristic point of view, he concludes the whole affair with this dogmatical pronouncement;—"A Transaction giving rise to endless criticism, then and afterwards. Transaction plainly not reconcilable with the letter of the law; and liable to have logic chopped upon it to any amount, and to all lengths of time. The Teutschmeister and his German Brethren shrieked murder; *the whole world*, then, and for long afterwards, *had much to say and argue*. To us, now that the logic-chaff is all laid long since, *the question is substantial, not formal*. If the Teutsch Ritterdom was actually at this time *dead*, actually stumbling about as a mere galvanized Lie beginning to be putrid,—then, sure enough, it behoved that somebody should bury it, to avoid pestilential effects in the neighbourhood. Somebody or other;—first flaying the skin off, as was natural, and taking that for his trouble. All

turns, in substance, on this latter question! If, again, the Ritterdom was not dead—?—And truly it struggled as hard as Partridge the Almanac-maker to rebut that fatal accusation; complained (Teutschmeister and German-Papist part of it) loudly at the Diets; got Albert and his consorts put to the Ban (*geächtet*), fiercely menaced by the Kaiser Karl V. But nothing came of all that; nothing but noise. Albert maintained his point; Kaiser Karl always found his hands full otherwise, and had nothing but stamped parchments and menaces to fire off at Albert. Teutsch Ritterdom, the Popish part of it, did enjoy its valuable bailliwicks, and very considerable rents in various quarters of Germany and Europe, having lost only Preussen; and walked about, for three centuries more, with money in its pocket, and a solemn white gown with black cross on its back,—the most opulent Social Club in existence, and an excellent place for bestowing younger sons of sixteen quarters. But it was, and continued through so many centuries, in every essential respect, a solemn Hypocrisy; a functionless merely eating Phantasm, of the nature of goblin, hungry ghost or ghoul (of which kind there are many);—till Napoleon finally ordered it to vanish; its time, even as Phantasm, being come.”—Vol. i. pp. 252-53.

This style of disposing of a serious question of law and justice may pass with the admirers of Mr. Carlyle; but to thinking readers, we imagine, it will seem little better than a mockery of all the true principles of the functions of a historian.

It is time, however, to pass on to the true hero of these preliminary volumes, Frederick William, the father of Frederick the Great. Mr. Carlyle acknowledges that “in what is called the Political, Diplomatic ‘Honour-to-be’ Department, there is not, nor ever can be, much to be said of him,” and that “as a King he has next to nothing of what is called History.” To Mr. Carlyle and his readers he must have “as Father and daily teacher and master of young Fritz, a continual interest;” and, even for himself, he is noticeable “as a fellow-man of singular faculty and in a most peculiar and conspicuous situation.”

Here, then, is his portrait.

“He was not tall of stature, this arbitrary King: a florid-complexioned stout-built man; of serious, sincere, authoritative face;

his attitudes and equipments very Spartan in type. Man of short firm stature ; stands (in Pesne's best Portraits of him) at his ease, and yet like a tower. Most solid ; ' plumb and rather more ; ' eyes steadfastly awake ; cheeks slightly compressed, too, which fling the mouth rather forward ; as if asking silently, ' Anything astir, then ? All right here ? ' Face, figure, and bearing, all in him is expressive of robust insight, and direct determination ; of healthy energy, practicality, unquestioned authority,—a certain air of royalty reduced to its simplest form. The face, in Pictures by Pesne and others, is not beautiful or agreeable ; healthy, genuine, authoritative, is the best you can say of it. Yet it may have been, what it is described as being, originally handsome. High enough arched brow, rather copious cheeks and jaws ; nose smallish, inclining to be stumpy ; large gray eyes, bright with steady fire and life, often enough gloomy and severe, but capable of jolly laughter too. Eyes ' naturally with a kind of laugh in them,' says Pöllnitz ;—which laugh can blaze out into fearful thunderous rage, if you give him provocation. Especially if you lie to him ; for that he hates above all things. Look him straight in the face : he fancies he can see in *your* eyes, if there is an internal mendacity in you : wherefore you must look at him in speaking ; such is his standing order.

" His hair is flaxen, falling into the ashgray or darker ; fine copious flowing hair, while he wore it natural. But it soon got tied into clubs, in the military style ; and at length it was altogether cropped away, and replaced by brown, and at last by white, round wigs. Which latter also, though bad wigs, became him not amiss, under his cocked-hat and cockade, says Pöllnitz. The voice, I guess, even when not loud, was of clangorous and penetrating, quasi-metallic nature ; and I learn expressly once, that it had a nasal quality in it. His Majesty spoke through the nose ; snuffled his speech, in an earnest ominously plangent manner. In angry moments, which were frequent, it must have been—unpleasant to listen to. For the rest, a handsome man of his inches ; conspicuously well built in limbs and body, and delicately finished-off to the very extremities. His feet and legs, says Pöllnitz, were very fine. The hands, if he would have taken care of them, were beautifully white ; fingers long and thin ; a hand at once nimble to grasp, delicate to feel, and strong to clutch and hold : what may be called a beautiful hand, because it is the usefulest.

" Nothing could exceed his Majesty's simplicity of habitudes. But one loves especially in him his scrupulous attention to cleanliness of person and of environment. He washed like a very Mussulman, five times a day ; loved cleanliness in all things, to a superstitious extent ; which trait is pleasant in the rugged man, and indeed of a piece with the rest of his character. He is gradually changing all his silk and other cloth-room furniture ; in his hatred of dust he will not suffer a floor-carpet, even a stuffed chair ; but insists on having all of wood, where the dust may be prosecuted to

destruction. Wife and womankind, and those that take after them, let such have stuffing and sofas: he, for his part, sits on mere wooden chairs;—sits, and also thinks and acts, after the manner of a Hyperborean Spartan, which he was. He ate heartily, but as a rough farmer and hunter eats; country messes, good roast and boiled; despising the French Cook, as an entity without meaning for him. His favourite dish at dinner was bacon and greens, rightly dressed; what could the French Cook do for such a man? He ate with rapidity, almost with indiscriminate violence; his object not quality but quantity. He drank too, but did not get drunk: at the Doctor's order he could abstain; and had in later years abstained. Pöllnitz praises his fineness of complexion, the originally eminent whiteness of his skin, which he had tanned and bronzed by hard riding and hunting, and otherwise worse discoloured by his manner of feeding and digesting: alas, at last his waistcoat came to measure, I am afraid to say how many Prussian ells,—a very considerable diameter indeed!

“For some years after his accession, he still appeared occasionally in ‘burgher dress,’ or unmilitary clothes; ‘brown English coat, yellow waistcoat’ and the other indispensables. But this fashion became rarer with him every year; and ceased altogether (say Chronologists) about the year 1719: after which he appeared always simply as Colonel of the Potsdam Guards (his own Life-guard Regiment) in simple Prussian uniform: close military coat; blue, with red cuffs and collar, buff waistcoat and breeches, white linen gaiters to the knee. He girt his sword about the loins, well out of the mud; walked always with a thick bamboo in his hand. Steady, not slow of step; with his triangular hat, cream-white round wig (in his older days), and face tending to purple,—the eyes looking out mere investigation, sharp swift authority, and dangerous readiness to rebuke and set the cane in motion:—it was so he walked abroad in this earth; and the common run of men rather fled his approach than courted it.”—Vol. i. pp. 416-19.

Mr. Carlyle adds a few of the many anecdotes as to the habits and manners of the man, which are still remembered in old Prussian society—his hitting over the crown, and sending home to his work, an idle loungee in the streets; his making the apple-women work at their knitting while waiting at their stalls for custom; his rough jokes and good-humoured collisions with wayfarers or chance visitors of Berlin; the device (similar to one said to have been put in practice by the London tailors, in order to de-popularize the McIntosh overcoat at its first appearance,) by which he drove French fashions out of Berlin:—“dressed up, namely, his Scavenger-Executioner people (what they call *Profossen* in Prussian regiments) in an enormous exag-

generation of that costume ; cocked hats about an ell in diameter, wigs reaching to the houghs, with other fittings to match : these, when Count Rothenburg and his company appeared upon the ground, Friedrich Wilhelm summoned out, with some trumpet-peal or burst of field-music ; and they solemnly crossed Count Rothenburg's field of vision ; the strangest set of Phantasms he had seen lately. Awakening salutary reflections in him. Fancy that scene in History ; Friedrich Wilhelm for comic-symbolic Dramaturgist. Gods and men (or at least Houyhnhmn horses) might have saluted it with a Homeric laugh,—so huge and vacant is it, with a suspicion of real humour too :—but the men were not permitted, on parade, more than a silent grin, or general irrepressible rustling murmur ; and only the gods laughed inextinguishably, if so disposed. The Scavenger-Executioners went back to their place ; and Count Rothenburg took a plain German costume, so long as he continued in those parts.”—Vol. i. pp. 421-22.

Such is Mr. Carlyle's “original North-German Spartan,” over whom “the flunkey world,” not ruling itself by Mr. Carlyle's dicta, may “shriek a good deal.” But Nature, Mr. Carlyle insists, who made him, and who “when she makes a Spartan means a good deal by it,” will keep her own councils the while, and laugh in her sleeve at the shrieks of the “flunkey world.” The “flunkey world,” it is true, wrath at being “stript of its plush and fat perquisites,” has accused Frederick William of avarice and other cognate vices. But Mr. Carlyle knows better. Intrinsically, and in the main, he contends, Frederick's procedure is to be defined as “honourable thrift, verging towards avarice here and there, as poor human virtues usually lean to one side or the other.” And yet in the same breath in which he pronounces this verdict, he can tell of him the following piece of petty pride, coupled with shabbiness and lying.

“The Czar Peter, for example, used to be rather often in the Prussian Dominions, oftenest on business of his own : such a man is to be royally defrayed while with us ; yet one would wish it done cheap. Posthorses, ‘two-hundred and eighty-seven at every station,’ he has from the Community ; but the rest of his expenses, from Memel all the way to Wesel ? Friedrich Wilhelm's marginal response to his *Finanz Directorium*, requiring orders once on that subject, runs in the following strange tenour : ‘Yes, all the way

(except Berlin, which I take upon myself); and observe, you contrive to do it for 6,000 thalers (900*l.*),—which is uncommonly cheap, about 1*l.* per mile ;—‘won’t allow you one other penny (*nicht einen Pfennig gebe mehr dazu*); but you are (*sollen Sie*),’ this is the remarkable point, ‘to give out in the world that it costs me from Thirty to Forty Thousand !’ ”—Vol. i. p. 424.

Mr. Carlyle, who persistently represents Frederick William as the one “who beyond all men abhors lies,” describes this as a kind of lie or fib, (white fib, or even *gray*)! And his final verdict is, that he was a “Spartan man, as we said, though probably he knows as little of the Spartans as the Spartans did of him ;” and it is a common exemplification of his theories of human nature, and of his habit of utterly ignoring all superhuman influences and obligations, that he estimates not alone the dispositions but even the duties and principles, which besee men now-a-days, by precisely the same standard which would be applied to society in which Christianity had never been dreamed of. “Nature,” he concludes, “is still capable of such products; if in Hellas long ages since, why not in Brandenburg now?”

The most pleasing glimpses which we obtain of the character of this Spartan King are those which show him in his early relations to his son, the young Fritz. Bating the stupid and obstinate bigotry (not very dissimilar from that which characterized our own George III.) which it displays, there is much of positive good in the following abstract of Frederick’s direction to the instructors of his son.

“‘1. Must impress my Son with a proper love and fear of God, as the foundation and sole pillar of our temporal and eternal welfare. No false religions, or sects of Atheist, Arian (Arrian), Socinian, or whatever name the poisonous things have, which can so easily corrupt a young mind, are to be even named in his hearing; on the other hand, a proper abhorrence (*Abscheu*) of Papistry, and insight into its baselessness and nonsensicality (*Ungrund und Absurdität*), is to be communicated to him :’—Papistry, which is false enough, like the others, but impossible to be ignored like them ; mention that, and give him due abhorrence for it. For we are Protestant to the bone in this country ; and cannot stand *Absurdität*, least of all hypocritically-religious ditto ! But the grand thing will be, ‘To impress on him the true religion, which consists essentially in this, That Christ died for all men,’ and generally that the Almighty’s justice is eternal and omnipresent,—‘which consideration is the only means of keeping a sovereign person (*souver-*

raîne Macht), or one freed from human penalties, in the right way.'

"2. 'He is to learn no Latin,' observe that, however it may surprise you. What has a living German man and King, of the eighteenth Christian *Sæculum*, to do with dead old Heathen Latins, Romans, and the lingo *they* spoke their fraction of sense and nonsense in? Frightful, how the young years of the European Generations have been wasted, for ten centuries back; and the Thinkers of the world have become mere walking Sacks of Marine-stores, '*Gelehrten*, Learned,' as they call themselves; and gone *lost* to the world, in that manner, as a set of confiscated Pedants;—babbling about said Heathens, and *their* extinct lingo and fraction of sense and nonsense, for the thousand years last past! Heathen Latins, Romans;—who perhaps were no great things of Heathen, after all, if well seen into? I have heard judges say, they were inferior, in real worth and grist, to German homegrowths we have had, if the confiscated Pedants could have discerned it! At any rate, they are dead, buried deep, these two-thousand years; well out of our way;—and nonsense enough of our own left, to keep sweeping into corners. Silence about their lingo and them, to this new Crown-Prince! 'Let the Prince learn French and German,' so as to write and speak, with brevity and propriety,' in these two languages, which may be useful to him in life. That will suffice for languages,—provided he have anything effectually rational to say in them. For the rest,

"3. 'Let him learn Arithmetic, Mathematics, Artillery,—Economy to the very bottom.' And, in short, useful knowledge generally; useless ditto not at all. 'History in particular;—Ancient History only slightly (*nur überhin*);—but the history of the last Hundred-and-fifty Years to the exactest pitch. The *Jus Naturale* and *Jus Gentium*,' by way of handlamp to History, 'he must be completely master of; as also of Geography, whatever is remarkable in each Country. And in Histories, most especially the History of the House of Brandenburg; where he will find domestic examples, which are always of more force than foreign. And along with Prussian History, chiefly that of the Countries which have been connected with it, as England, Brunswick, Hessen, and the others. And in reading of wise History-books there must be considerations made (*sollen beyrn Lesen kluger Historiarum Betrachtungen gemacht werden*) upon the causes of the events.'—Surely, O King!

"4. 'With increasing years, you will more and more, to a most especial degree, go upon Fortification,'—mark you!—'the Formation of a Camp, and the other War-Sciences; that the Prince may, from youth upwards, be trained to act as Officer and General, and to seek all his glory in the soldier profession.' This is whither it must all tend. You, Finkenstein and Kalkstein, 'have both of you, in the highest measure, to make it your care to infuse into my Son' (*einzuprägen*, stamp into him) 'a true love for the Soldier

business, and to impress on him that, as there is nothing in the world which can bring a Prince renown and honour like the sword, so he would be a despised creature before all men, if he did not love it, and seek his sole glory (*die einzige Gloria*) therein.' Which is an extreme statement of the case; showing how much we have it at heart."—Vol. i. pp. 466-67.

And another more detailed paper of instructions is also preserved.

"To Head Governor von Finkenstein, Sub-Governor von Kalkstein, Preceptor Jacques Egide Duhan de Jandun, and others whom it may concern: Regulations for schooling, at Wusterhausen, 3d September 1721;—in greatly abridged form.

"Sunday. On Sunday he is to rise at 7; and as soon as he has got his slippers on, shall kneel down at his bed-side, and pray to God, so as all in the room may hear it (that there be no deception or short-measure palmed upon us), in these words: 'Lord God, blessed Father, I thank thee from my heart that thou hast so graciously preserved me through this night. Fit me for what thy holy will is; and grant that I do nothing this day, nor all the days of my life, which can divide me from thee. For the Lord Jesus, my Redeemer's sake. Amen.' After which the Lord's Prayer. Then rapidly and vigorously (*geschwinde und hurtig*) wash himself clean, dress and powder and comb himself: we forget to say, that while they are combing and queuing him, he breakfasts, with brevity, on tea: Prayer, with washing, breakfast and the rest, to be done pointedly within fifteen minutes,—that is, at a quarter-past 7.

"This finished, all his Domestic and Duhan shall come in, and do family worship (*das grosse Gebet zu halten*): Prayer on their knees, Duhan withal to read a Chapter of the Bible, and sing some proper Psalm or Hymn (as practised in well-regulated families):—it will then be a quarter to 8. All the Domestic then withdraw again; and Duhan now reads with my Son the Gospel of the Sunday; expounds it a little, adducing the main points of Christianity;—questioning from Noltenius's Catechism (which Fritz knows by heart): it will then be 9 o'clock.

"At 9 he brings my Son down to me; who goes to Church, and dines, along with me (dinner at the stroke of Noon): the rest of the day is then his own (Fritz's and Duhan's). At half-past 9 in the evening, he shall come and bid me goodnight. Shall then directly go to his room; very rapidly (*sehr geschwind*) get off his clothes, wash his hands (get into some tiny dressing-gown or *casacaquin*, no doubt); and so soon as that is done, Duhan makes a prayer on his knees, and sings a hymn; all the Servants being again there. Instantly after which, my Son shall get into bed; shall be in bed at half-past 10;—(and fall asleep how soon, your Majesty? This is very strict work.)

"*Monday.* On Monday, as on all weekdays, he is to be called at 6; and so soon as called he is to rise, you are to stand to him (*anhalten*) that he do not loiter or turn in bed, but briskly and at once get up; and say his prayers, the same as on Sunday morning. This done, he shall as rapidly as possible get on his shoes and spatterdashes; also wash his face and hands, but not with soap. Farther shall put on his *cassaquin* (short dressing-gown), have his hair combed out and queued, but not powdered. While getting combed and queued, he shall at the same time take breakfast of tea, so that both jobs go on at once; and all this shall be ended before half-past 6. Then enter Duhan and the Domestics, with worship, Bible, Hymn, all as on Sunday; this is done by 7, and the Servants go again.

"From 7 till 9 Duhan takes him on History; at 9 comes Noltinius (a sublime Clerical Gentleman from Berlin,) with the Christian Religion, till a quarter to 11. Then Fritz rapidly (*geschwind*) washes his face with water, hands with soap-and-water; clean shirt; powders, and puts on his coat;—about 11 comes to the King. Stays with the King till 2,—perhaps promenading a little; dining always at Noon; after which Majesty is apt to be slumberous, and light amusements are over.

"Directly at 2, he goes back to his room. Duhan is there, ready; takes him upon the Maps and Geography, from 2 to 3,—giving account (gradually) of all the European Kingdoms; their strength and weakness; size, riches and poverty of their towns. From 3 to 4, Duhan treats of Morality (*soll die Moral tractiren*). From 4 to 5, Duhan shall write German Letters with him, and see that he gets a good *stylum* (which he never in the least did). About 5, Fritz shall wash his hands, and go to the King;—ride out; divert himself, in the air and not in his room; and do what he likes, if it is not against God."—Vol. i. pp. 474-75.

Nevertheless, this Spartan treatment worked but indifferently. Fritz, from the first, had a leaning to French tastes and French ideas, and never took kindly to his father's designs in his regard. Many of the boy's fancies were incomprehensible to his father—his taste for music and the little fineries of boyish costume—his stolen marches "into the domain" of Latin and other forbidden things. The collision of tastes led to rigour on the one hand, and to dislike and disobedience, with a large admixture of hypocritical concealment, on the other. These relations of the boy with his father, too, were made even more mischievous in their results from being shared with his sister, Wilhelmina, and to a great extent encouraged, or at least screened from discovery, by their mother; and at a later

period they developed themselves into those scandalous and unhappy conflicts of which the world has heard so much.

Meanwhile, however, Frederick William pursued his own favourite schemes, on the details of which Mr. Carlyle dwells with much complacency. The well-known history of the Potsdam regiment of giants need not be repeated here, but there is one circumstance connected with it which may be new to our readers, namely, that Ireland contributed her quota to this battalion of military monstrosities.

"Men from all countries ; a hundred and odd come annually, as we saw from Russia,—a very precious windfall : the rest have been collected, crimped, purchased out of every European country, at enormous expense, not to speak of other trouble to his Majesty. James Kirkman, an Irish recruit of good inches, cost him £1200 before he could be got inveigled, shipped and brought safe to hand. The documents are yet in existence ; and the Portrait of this Irish fellow-citizen himself, who is by no means a beautiful man. Indeed, they are all portrayed ; all the privates of this distinguished Regiment are, if anybody cared to look at them. 'Redivannoff from Moscow' seems of far better bone than Kirkman, though still more stolid of aspect. One Hohmann, a born Prussian, was so tall, you could not, though yourself tall, touch his bare crown with your hand ; August the Strong of Poland tried, on one occasion, and could not. Before Hohmann turned up, there had been 'Jonas the Norwegian Blacksmith,' also a dreadfully tall monster. Giant 'Macdoli,'—who was to be married, no consent asked on *either* side, to the tall young woman, which latter turned out to be a decrepit *old* woman (all Jest-Books know the myth),—he also was an Irish Giant, his name probably M'Dowal."—Vol. i. pp. 578-79.

One of the plans for the future of the youthful Fritz, which contributed to complete his alienation from his father, was the celebrated project of the double-marriage, (which appears to have been originally of the queen's devising, but which was at first earnestly adopted by the king, although he afterwards altered his purpose to suit other views of political advantage,) a plan for marrying Frederick and Wilhelmina to a princess and prince of the English Hanoverian house. It would be tedious to advert to all the vicissitudes of this project, and of the negotiations to which it led. Nor shall we dwell on the painful details of the quarrel of father and son, which Mr. Carlyle, in his grotesque but yet most striking manner, has graphically portrayed. But we cannot overlook his ren-

dering of that memorable episode in the life of both—the attempted flight of the Crown-Prince, his arrest and imprisonment, and the condemnation and execution of the friend who had been his confidant and assistant in the undertaking. Here is the Spartan king in the bosom of his family, as described by his daughter, Wilhelmina.

“The Queen was alone in his Majesty’s Apartment, waiting for him as he approached. At sight of her, in the distance, he called out : ‘Your losel of a Son (*voire indigne fils*) has ended at last ; you have done with him,’ or words to that effect. ‘What,’ cried the Queen, ‘you have had the barbarity to kill him ?’—‘Yes, I tell you,—but where is the sealed Desk ?’ The Queen went to her own Apartment to fetch it ; I ran in to her there for a moment : she was out of herself, wringing her hands, crying incessantly, and said without ceasing : ‘*Mon Dieu, mon fils* (O God, my Son)’ Breath failed me ; I fell fainting into the arms of Madam de Sonsfeld.’—The Queen took away the Writing-case ; King tore out the letters, and went off ; upon which the Queen came down again to us.

“We learned from some attendant that, at least, my Brother was not dead. The King now came back. We all ran to kiss his hands ; but he no sooner noticed than rage and fury took possession of him. He became black in the face, his eyes sparkling fire, his mouth foaming. ‘Infamous *canaille*,’ said he : ‘darest thou show thyself before me ? Go, keep thy scoundrel of a Brother company !’ And so saying, he seized me with one hand, slapping me on the face with the other,—clenched as a fist (*poing*),—several blows ; one of which struck me on the temple, so that I fell back, and should have split my head against a corner of the wainscot, had not Madam de Sonsfeld caught me by the headdress and broken the fall. I lay on the ground without consciousness. The King, in a frenzy, was for striking me with his feet ; had not the Queen, my Sisters, and the rest, run between, and those who were present prevented him. They all ranked themselves round me, which gave Mesdames de Kamecke and Sonsfeld time to pick me up. They put me in a chair in the embrasure of a window ; threw water on my face to bring me to life : which care I lamentably reproached them with, death being a thousand times better, in the pass things had come to. The Queen kept shrieking, her firmness had quite left her : she wrung her hands, and ran in despair up and down the room. The King’s face was so disfigured with rage, it was frightful to look upon. The little ones were on their knees, begging for me.”—Vol. ii. pp. 268-69.

The sequel is less violent but hardly less repulsive.

“The King had now changed his tune : he admitted that my Brother was still alive ; but vowed horribly he would put him to death, and lay me fast, within four walls, for the rest of my life.

He accused me of being the Prince's accomplice, whose crime was high treason ;—also of having an intrigue of love with Katta, to whom he said I had borne several children. The timid Governante flamed up at this unheard-of insult : 'That is not true,' said she fiercely, ' whoever has told your Majesty such a thing has told a lie !' 'O, spare my Brother, and I will marry the Duke of Weissenfels,' whimpered I ; but in the great noise he did not hear ; and while I strove to repeat it louder, Sonsfeld clapt her handkerchief on my face.

"Hustling aside to get rid of the handkerchief, I saw Katta crossing the Square. Four soldiers were conducting him to the King ; trunks, my Brother's and his own, sealed, were coming on the rear. Pale and downcast, he took off his hat to salute me,—poor Katta, to me always so prostrate in silent respect, and now so unhappy ! A moment after, the King, hearing he was come, went out, exclaiming, 'Now I shall have proof about the scoundrel Fritz and the offscouring (*canaille*) Wilhelmina ; clear proofs to cut the heads off them.'—The two Hofdames again interfered ; and one of them, Kamecke it was, rebuked him ; told him in the tone of a prophetess, To take care what he was doing. Whom his Majesty gazed into with astonishment, but rather with respect than with anger, saying, 'Your intentions are good !'

"And so his Majesty flung out, seeking Katta ; and vanished : Wilhelmina saw no more of him for about a year after ; being ordered to her room, and kept prisoner there on low diet, with sentries guarding her doors, and no outlook but the worst horror her imagination pleased to paint."—Vol. ii. pp. 269-70.

Nor was this a passing ebullition of anger. He carried his design of vengeance or punishment to the last extremity. The sentence of the court-martial, which he himself appointed, might appear rigorous enough, but it was too gentle for this Spartan king. Read Mr. Carlyle's own account of the king's dealing with the sentence of the judges.

"Accomplices of the Crown-Prince are two : *First*, Lieutenant Keith, actual deserter (who cannot be caught): To be hanged in effigy, cut in four quarters, and nailed to the gallows at Wesel :—*Good*, says his Majesty. *Secondly*, Lieutenant Katta of the Gens-d'Armes, intended deserter, not actually deserting, and much tempted thereto : All things considered, Two years of Fortress Arrest to Lieutenant Katta :—*Not good* this ; *Bad* this, thinks Majesty ; this provokes from his Majesty an angry rebuke to the too lax Court-Martial. Rebuke which can still be read, in growling, unluclid phraseology ; but with a rhadamanthine idea clear enough in it, and with a practical purport only too clear : That Katta was a sworn soldier, of the Gens-d'Armes even, or Body-

guard of the Prussian Majesty ; and did nevertheless, in the teeth of his oath, ' worship the Rising Sun ' when minded to desert ; did plot and colleague with Foreign Courts in aid of said Rising Sun, and of an intended high crime against the Prussian Majesty itself on Rising Sun's part ; far from at once revealing the same, as duty ordered Lieutenant Katte to do. That Katte's crime amounts to high treason (*crimen læsæ majestatis*) ; that the rule is, *Fiat justitia, et pereat mundus* ;—and that, in brief, Katte's doom is, and is hereby declared to be, Death. Death by the gallows and hot pincers is the usual doom of Traitors ; but his Majesty will say in this case, Death by the sword and headsman simply ; certain circumstances moving the royal clemency to go so far, no farther. And the Court-Martial has straightway to apprise Katte of this same : and so doing ' shall say, That his Majesty is sorry for Katte ; but that it is better he die than that justice depart out of the world ' (*Wusterhausen, 1st November, 1730*).
FRIEDRICH WILHELM."

—Vol. ii. pp. 287-88.

This is very terrible. But Mr. Carlyle has no patience with those who think so, as may be inferred from the characteristic words in which he brings the whole narrative to a close. " ' Never was such a transaction before or since, in Modern History,' cries the angry reader : ' cruel, like the grinding of human hearts under millstones, like—' Or, indeed, *like the doings of the gods, which are cruel, though not that alone ?*—"

From this period forward, Mr. Carlyle's narrative shows us more of Frederick, but still purely according to Mr. Carlyle's own peculiar and most one-sided view. We have been forcibly reminded throughout his portraiture of Frederick, of Lord Macaulay's William of Orange—the same consistent determination to see nothing but the virtues of the hero, and to soften down, explain away, and even positively disbelieve, everything in the ordinary narratives of his life which may clash with this preconceived determination. All the world, for example, has heard of the Crown-Prince's imprisonment and exile at Custrin, by order of his father, in punishment of the attempted flight of which we have just been writing, and of the long self-imposed restraint and submission, by which he won back the favour which he had forfeited. Ordinary critics of the character of Frederick had read in the course somewhat of a hypocritical character, somewhat of a putting on both of habits and of opinions very different from his own, for the purpose of inducing his father to relax the rigour which he had enforced against him. It must be confessed

that even in Mr. Carlyle's pages a good deal of this peeps out. In one place (ii. 341) we find the prince writing to his father, that he "depends on his most All-Gracious father's grace that he will be good to him," that he "asks for nothing and no happiness in the world but what comes from his father." In another he tells a friendly privy-councillor, who visits him in his exile, that "he was not afraid so much of anything as of living constantly beside his father." (347.) And yet in the face of this and many similar indications, Mr. Carlyle can put no harder construction on Frederick's self-imposed manner of life at Custring, than that "unpermitted things, once for all, he must avoid to do: perhaps he will gradually discover that many of them were foolish things better not done. He walks warily; to this all things continually admonish. We trace in him some real desire to be wise, to do and learn what is useful if he can here. But the grand problem, which is reality itself to him, is always, To regain favour with Papa. And this, Papa being what he is, gives a twist to all other problems the young man may have, for they must all shape themselves by this; and introduces something of artificial,—not *properly of hypocritical*, for that too is fatal if found out,—but of calculated, reticent, of half-sincere, on the Son's part: an inevitable feature, plentifully visible in their Correspondence now and henceforth. Corresponding with Papa and his Grumkow, and watched, at every step, by such an Argus as the Tobacco-Parliament, real frankness of speech is not quite the recommendable thing; apparent frankness may be the safer! Besides mastery in the Domain Sciences, I perceive the Crown-Prince had to study here another part, useful to him in after life: the art of wearing among his fellow-creatures a polite cloak-of-darkness. Gradually he becomes master of it as few are: a man politely impregnable to the intrusion of human curiosity; able to look cheerily into the very eyes of men, and talk in a social way face to face, and yet continue intrinsically invisible to them. An art no less essential to Royalty than that of the Domain Sciences itself; and,—if at all consummately done, and with a *scorn of mendacity* for help, as in this case,—a difficult art. It is the chief feature in the Two or Three Thousand *Letters* we yet have of Friedrich's to all manner of correspondents: Letters written with the gracefullest flowing rapidity; polite, affable,—refusing to give you

the least glimpse into his real inner man, or tell you any particular you might impertinently wish to know."—
Vol. ii. pp. 332-33.

One or two other examples of Mr. Carlyle's indulgent judgments of Frederick we cannot overlook. The long-cherished plan of the double marriage had been abandoned. Poor Wilhelmina, instead of the splendid Anglo-Hanoverian alliance which her mother had destined for her, had to ally herself with the comparatively humble fortunes of the hereditary prince of Baireuth. For Frederick himself his father has chosen a bride in the young princess of Bevern, a niece of the empress. The views of the hopeful bridegroom in entering into the alliance, as declared openly in the correspondence published by Mr. Carlyle himself, are such as we should think must shock every mind not utterly lost, we do not say to delicacy, but even to the lowest sense of domestic virtue and honour. It is not merely that he makes an entire surrender of every pretence of the feeling of affection for the lady who may be selected for him. Not merely does he avow his entire indifference for her, and even put on the affectation of positive dislike, in order to make the seeming sacrifice of his own will to his father's more meritorious in the eyes of the latter. All this no doubt is hard to reconcile with Mr. Carlyle's ideal. But there is far worse. We are ashamed to transcribe the following letter, written by himself to his confidential go-between with his father, General von Grumkow, which Mr. Carlyle translates and intersperses as usual with his own strange observations and commentaries.

"My dear General and Friend,—I was charmed to learn by your Letter that my affairs are on so good a footing (Papa so well satisfied with my professions of obedience); and you may depend on it I am docile to follow your advice. I will lend myself to whatever is possible for me; and provided I can secure the King's favour by my obedience, I will do all that is within my power.

"Nevertheless, in making my bargain with the Duke of Bevern, manage that the *Corpus Delicti* (my Intended) be brought up under her Grandmother (Duchess of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, Ludwig Rudolf's Spouse, an airy coquettish Lady,—let her be the tutoress and model of my Intended, O General). For I should prefer *being made a—what shall we say? by a light wife*,—or to serve under the haughty *fontange* of my Spouse (as Ludwig Rudolf does, by all accounts), than to have a blockhead who would drive me mad by her ineptitudes, and whom I should be ashamed to produce.

"I beg you labour at this affair. When one hates romance heroines as heartily as I do, one dreads those 'virtues' of the ferocious type (*les vertus farouches*, so terribly aware that they are virtuous); and I had rather marry the greatest—(unnameable)—in Berlin, than a devotee with half-a-dozen ghastly hypocrites (*caçots*) at her beck. If it were still *möglich* (possible, in German) to make her Calvinist (*Réformée*; our Court-Creed, which might have an allaying tendency, and at least would make her go with the stream)? But I doubt that:—I will insist, however, that her Grandmother have the training of her. What you can do to help in this, my dear Friend, I am persuaded you will do.

"It afflicted me a little that the King still has doubts of me, while I am obeying in such a matter, diametrically opposite to my own ideas. In what way shall I offer stronger proofs? I may give myself to the Devil, it will be to no purpose; nothing but the old song over again, doubt on doubt,—Don't imagine I am going to disoblige the Duke, the Duchess or the Daughter, I beseech you! I know too well what is due to them, and too much respect their merits, not to observe the strictest rules of what is proper,—even if I hated their progeny and them like the pestilence.

"I hope to speak to you with open heart at Berlin.—You may think, too, how I shall be embarrassed, having to do the *Amoroso* perhaps without being it, and to take an appetite for mute ugliness,—for I don't much trust Count Seckendorf's taste in this article,—in spite of his testimonies in Tobacco-Parliament and elsewhere. Monsieur! Once more, get this Princess to learn by heart the *École des Maris* and the *École des Femmes*; that will do her much more good than *True Christianity* by the late Mr. Arndt! If, besides, she would learn steadiness of humour (*toujours danser sur un pied*), learn music; and, *nota bene*, become rather too free than too virtuous,—ah then, my dear General, then I should feel some liking for her, and a Colin marrying a Phyllis, the couple would be in accordance: but if she is stupid, naturally I renounce the Devil and her.—It is said she has a Sister, who at least has common sense. Why take the eldest, if so? To the King it must be all one. There is also a Princess Christina Marie of Eisenach (real name being Christina *Wilhelmina*, but no matter), who would be quite my fit, and whom I should like to try for. In fine, I mean to come soon into your Countries; and perhaps will say like Cæsar, *Veni, vidi, vici*."—Vol. ii. pp. 387-89.

This, we must confess, is to us so revolting that we can hardly imagine Mr. Carlyle, with all his strange ideas of right and wrong, abstaining from one of his characteristic outbursts of indignation at the bare recital. But—will the reader believe it?—he has not a single word of wonder, much less of indignation, for this monstrous piece of

cynicism! He passes it over in silence among what he calls the prince's "utterances" in reference to the proposed marriage.

There is another piece of what to us appears excessive meanness and littleness of mind in Mr. Carlyle's hero, for which he as usual contrives to find an excuse, or at least an explanation. He had been duly married to his princess, (whom, by the way, he treated much as might be inferred from these secret preliminaries,) and restored to his father's favour. Some time after Frederick's marriage the health of Frederick William, which had been much broken down, completely gave way, insomuch that little hope was entertained of his recovery; and the prospect of speedy succession being open to Frederick, the courtiers, as is their wont, began to worship the rising sun. That the prospect of such a change should have some influence on the mind of a young man, especially one who had so long suffered from paternal tyranny, was not unnatural. But it will hardly explain the scene described in the following passage from the memoirs of his sister Wilhelmina.

"My Brother arrived, the 5th of October. He seemed to me put out (*décontenancé*); and to break off conversation with me, he said he had to write to the King and Queen. I ordered him pen and paper. He wrote in my room; and spent more than a good hour in writing a couple of Letters, of a line or two each. He then had all the Court, one after the other, introduced to him; said nothing to any of them, looked merely with a mocking air at them; after which we went to dinner.

"Here his whole conversation consisted in quizzing (*turlupiner*) whatever he saw; and repeating to me, above a hundred times over, the words 'little Prince,' 'little Court.' I was shocked; and could not understand how he had changed so suddenly towards me. The etiquette of all Courts in the Empire is, that nobody who has not at the least the rank of Captain can sit at a Prince's table: my Brother put a Lieutenant there, who was in his suite; saying to me, 'A King's Lieutenants are as good as a Margraf's Ministers.' I swallowed this incivility, and showed no sign.

"After dinner, being alone with me, he said,—turning up the flippant side of his thoughts, truly, in a questionable way:—'Our Sire is going to end (*tire à sa fin*); he will not live out this month. I know I have made you great promises; but I am not in a condition to keep them. I will leave you the Half of the sum which my predecessor (*feu Roi*) lent you; I think you will have every reason to be satisfied with that.' I answered, That my regard for him

had never been of an interested nature; that I would never ask anything of him, but the continuance of his friendship; and did not wish one sou, if it would in the least inconvenience him. 'No, no,' said he, 'you shall have those 100,000 thalers; I have destined them for you.—People will be much surprised,' continued he, 'to see me act quite differently from what they had expected. They imagine I am going to lavish all my treasures, and that money will become as common as pebbles at Berlin: but they will find I know better. I mean to increase my Army, and to leave all other things on the old footing. I will have every consideration for the Queen my Mother, and will sate her (*vassasierai*) with honours; but I do not mean that she shall meddle in my affairs; and if she try it she will find so.' What a speech; what an outbreak of candour in the young man, preoccupied with his own great thoughts and difficulties,—to the exclusion of any other person's!

"I fell from the clouds, on hearing all that; and knew not if I was sleeping or waking. He then questioned me on the affairs of this Country. I gave him the detail of them. He said to me: 'When your goose (*bénet*) of a Father-in-Law dies, I advise you to break up the whole Court, and reduce yourselves to the footing of a private gentleman's establishment, in order to pay your debts. In real truth you have no need of so many people; and you must try also to reduce the wages of those whom you cannot help keeping. You have been accustomed to live at Berlin with a table of four dishes; that is all you want here: and I will invite you now and then to Berlin; which will spare table and housekeeping.'

"For a long while my heart had been getting big; I could not restrain my tears, at hearing all these indignities. 'Why do you cry?' said he: 'Ah, ah, you are in low spirits, I see. We must dissipate that dark humour. The music waits us; I will drive that fit out of you by an air or two on the flute.' He gave me his hand, and led me into the other room. I sat down to the harpsichord; which I inundated (*inondai*) with my tears. Marwitz (my artful Demoiselle d'Atours, perhaps too artful in time coming), placed herself opposite me, so as to hide from the others what disorder I was in."—Vol. ii. pp. 531-32.

The reader will probably think this a very pitiable exhibition of littleness, and what in a less heroic character might be called purse-pride. Mr. Carlyle's severest judgment of it goes no further than the suggestion that "it may be the Crown-Prince, looking with an airy buoyancy of mind towards a certain event probably near, *has got his young head inflated a little*, and carries himself with a height now to this beloved sister!" And lest even this suggestion of a spot might dim the lustre of the sun which he worships so devoutly, he adds, "that probably the sad

humour of the princess herself had a good deal to do with it!"

We may break the monotony of these criticisms by introducing one or two of Mr. Carlyle's sketches of the literary friends and associates of his hero. That of Voltaire would be entirely too long for insertion, and besides, this portraiture, as we find it here, must be regarded as incomplete, and may much better be disposed of when we shall have the more advanced volumes of the biography before us. A few other less shining notabilities are hit off in the following passage.

"With the outer Berlin social world, acting and reacting, Friedrich has his connections, which obscurely emerge on us now and then. Literary Eminences, who are generally of Theological vesture; any follower of Philosophy, especially if he be of refined manners withal, or known in fashionable life, is sure to attract him; and gains ample recognition at Reinsberg or on Town-visits. But the Berlin Theological or Literary world at that time, still more the Berlin Social, like a sunk extinct object, continues very dim in those old records; and to say truth, what features we have of it do not invite to miraculous efforts for farther acquaintance. Venerable Beausobre, with his *History of the Manicheans*, and other learned things,—we heard of him long since, in Toland and the Republican Queen's time, as a light of the world. He is now fourscore, grown white as snow; very serene, polite, with a smack of French noblesse in him, perhaps a smack of affectation traceable too. The Crown-Prince, on one of his Berlin visits, wished to see this Beausobre; got a meeting appointed, in somebody's rooms 'in the French College,' and waited for the venerable man. Venerable man entered, loftily serene as a martyr Preacher of the Word, something of an ancient Seigneur de Beausobre in him, too; for the rest, soft as sunset, and really with fine radiances, in a somewhat twisted state, in that good old mind of his. 'What have you been reading lately, M. de Beausobre?' said the Prince, to begin conversation. 'Ah, Monseigneur, I have just risen from reading the sublimest piece of writing that exists.'—'And what?' 'The exordium of St. John's Gospel: *In the Beginning was the Word; and the Word was with God, and the Word was*—' Which somewhat took the Prince by surprise, as Formey reports; though he rallied straightway, and got good conversation out of the old gentleman. To whom, we perceive, he writes once or twice,—a copy of his own verses to correct, on one occasion,—and is very respectful and considerate.

"Formey tells us of another French sage, personally known to the Prince since Boyhood; for he used to be about the Palace, doing something. This is one La Croze; Professor of, I think,

'Philosophy' in the French College : sublime Monster of Erudition, at that time ; forgotten now, I fear by everybody. Swag-bellied, short of wind ; liable to rages, to utterances of a coarse nature ; a decidedly ugly, monstrous and rather stupid kind of man. Knew twenty languages, in a coarse inexact way. Attempted deep kinds of discourse, in the lecture-room and elsewhere ; but usually broke off into endless welters of anecdote, not always of cleanly nature ; and after every two or three words, a desperate sigh, not for sorrow, but on account of flabbiness and fat. Formey gives a portraiture of him ; not worth copying farther. The same Formey, standing one day somewhere on the streets of Berlin, was himself, he cannot doubt, *seen* by the Crown-Prince in passing ; ' who asked M. Jordan, who that was,' and got answer :—is not that a comfortable fact ? Nothing farther came of it ;—respectable Ex-Parson Formey, though ever ready with his pen, being indeed of very vapid nature, not wanted at Reinsberg, as we can guess.

" There is M. Achard, too, another Preacher, supreme of his sort, in the then Berlin circles ; to whom or from whom a Letter or two exist. Letters worthless, if it were not for one dim indication : That, on inquiry, the Crown-Prince had been consulting this supreme Achard on the difficulties of Orthodoxy ; and had given him texts, or a text, to preach from. Supreme Achard did not abolish the difficulties for his inquiring Prince,—who complains respectfully that ' his faith is weak,' and leaves us dark as to particulars. This Achard passage is almost the only hint we have of what might have been an important chapter : Friedrich's Religious History at Reinsberg. The expression ' weak faith' I take to be meant not in mockery, but in ingenuous regret and solicitude ; much painful fermentation, probably, on the religious question in those Reinsberg years ! But the old '*Gnadenwahl*' business, the Free-Grace controversy, had taught him to be cautious as to what he uttered on those points. The fermentation, therefore, had to go on under cover ; what the result of it was, is notorious enough ; though the steps of the process are not in any point known.

" Enough now of such details. Outwardly or inwardly, there is no History, or almost none, to be had of this Reinsberg Period ; the extensive records of it consisting, as usual, mainly of chaotic nugatory matter, opaque to the mind of readers. There is copious Correspondence of the Crown-Prince, with at least dates to it for most part : but this, which should be the main resource, proves likewise a poor one ; the Crown-Prince's Letters, now or afterwards, being almost never of a deep or intimate quality ; and seldom turning on events or facts at all, and then not always on facts interesting, on facts clearly apprehensible to us in that extinct element.

" The Thing, we know always, is there ; but vision of the Thing is only to be had faintly, intermittently. Dim inane twilight, with here and there a transient *spark* falling somewhither in it ;—you

do at last, by desperate persistence, get to discern outlines, features :—‘The Thing cannot *always* have been No-thing,’ you reflect ! Outlines, features :—and perhaps, after all, those are mostly what the reader wants on this occasion.”—Vol. ii. pp. 572-575.

We must make room for one extract more, although we have already gone far beyond our wont, feeling that Mr. Carlyle can never fairly be “expounded,” except in his own words,—the last scene of the life of the Spartan king. It is in a strain very different from most of what Mr. Carlyle has written in these volumes.

“Tuesday, 31st May, ‘about one in the morning,’ Cochius was again sent for. He found the King in very pious mood, but in great distress, and afraid he might yet have much pain to suffer. Cochius prayed with him ; talked piously. ‘I can remember nothing,’ said the King ; ‘I cannot pray, I have forgotten all my prayers.’—‘Prayer is not in words, but in the thought of the heart,’ said Cochius ; and soothed the heavy-laden man as he could. ‘Fare you well,’ said Friedrich Wilhelm, at length ; ‘most likely we shall not meet again in this world.’ Whereat Cochius burst into tears, and withdrew. About four, the King was again out of bed ; wished to see his youngest Boy, who had been ill of measles, but was doing well : ‘Poor little Ferdinand, adieu then, my little child !’ This is the Father of that fine Louis Ferdinand, who was killed at Jena ; concerning whom Berlin, in certain emancipated circles of it, still speaks with regret. He, the Louis Ferdinand, had fine qualities : but went far a-roving, into radicalism, into romantic love, into champagne ; and was cut down on the threshold of Jena, desperately fighting—perhaps happily for him.

“From little Ferdinand’s room Friedrich Wilhelm has himself rolled into Queen Sophie’s. ‘Fee-kin, Oh my Fee-kin, thou must rise this day, and help me what thou canst. This day I am going to die ; thou wilt be with me this day !’ The good Wife rises : I know not that it was the first time she had been so called ; but it did prove the last. Friedrich Wilhelm has decided, as the first thing he will do, to abdicate ; and all the Official persons and companions of the sick-room, Pöllnitz among them, not long after sunrise, are called to see it done. Pöllnitz, huddling on his clothes, arrived about five : in a corridor he sees the wheeled-chair and poor sick King ; steps aside to let him pass : ‘It is over (*Das ist vollbracht*),’ said the King, looking up to me as he passed : he had on his nightcap, and a blue mantle thrown round him. He was wheeled into his anteroom ; there let the company assemble : many of them are already there.

“The royal stables are visible from this room : Friedrich Wilhelm orders the horses to be ridden out : you old Fürst of Anhalt-

Dessau my oldest friend, you Colonel Hacke faithfulest of Adjutant-Generals, take each of you a horse, the best you can pick out : it is my last gift to you. Dessau, in silence, with dnm-show of thanks, points to a horse, any horse : 'You have chosen the very worst,' said Friedrich Wilhelm : 'take that other, I will warrant him a good one !' The grim Old Dessauer thanks in silence ; speechless grief is on that stern gunpowder face, and he seems even to be struggling with tears. 'Nay, nay, my friend,' Friedrich Wilhelm said, 'this is a debt we have all to pay.'

"The Official people, Queen, Friedrich, Minister Boden, Minister Podewils, and even Pöllnitz, being now all present, Friedrich Wilhelm makes his Declaration, at considerable length ; old General Bredow repeating it aloud, sentence by sentence, the King's own voice being too weak ; so that all may hear : 'That he abdicates, gives up wholly, in favour of his good Son Friedrich ; that foreign Ambassadors are to be informed ; that you are all to be true and loyal to my Son as you were to me'—and what else is needful. To which the judicious Podewils makes answer, 'That there must first be a written Deed of this high Transaction executed, which shall be straightway set about ; the Deed once executed, signed and sealed,—the high Royal will, in all points, takes effect.' Alas, before Podewils has done speaking, the King is like falling into a faint ; does faint, and is carried to bed : too unlikely any Deed of Abdication will be needed.

"Ups and downs there still were ; sore fluctuating labour, as the poor King struggles to his final rest, this morning. He was at the window again, when the *Wacht-parade* (Grenadiers on Guard) turned out ; he saw them make their evolutions for the last time. After which, new relapse, new fluctuation. It was about eleven o'clock, when Cochiuss was again sent for. The King lay speechless, seemingly still conscious, in bed ; Cochiuss prays with fervour, in a loud tone, that the dying King may hear and join. 'Not so loud !' says the King, rallying a little. He had remembered that it was the season when his servants got their new liveries ; they had been ordered to appear this day in full new costume : 'O vanity ! O vanity !' said Friedrich Wilhelm, at sight of the ornamented plush. 'Pray for me, pray for me ; my trust is in the Saviour !' he often said. His pains, his weakness are great ; the cordage of a most tough heart rending itself piece by piece. At one time he called for a mirror : that is certain ;—rugged wild man, son of Nature to the last. The mirror was brought ; what he said at sight of his face is variously reported : 'Not so worn out as I thought,' is Pöllnitz's account, and the likeliest ;—though perhaps he said several things, 'ugly face,' 'as good as dead already ;' and continued the inspection for some moments. A grim, strange thing.

"Feel my pulse, Pitsch," said he, noticing the Surgeon of his Giants : 'tell me how long this will last.'—'Alas, not long,' answered Pitsch.—'Say not, alas ; but how do you (He) know ?'—'The pulse

is gone!'—'Impossible,' said he, lifting his arm: 'how could I move my fingers so, if the pulse were gone?' Pitsch looked mournfully steadfast. 'Herr Jesu, to thee I live; Herr Jesu, to thee I die; in life and in death thou art my gain (*Du bist mein Gewinn*). These were the last words Friedrich Wilhelm spoke in this world. He again fell into a faint. Eller gave a signal to the Crown-Prince to take the Queen away. Scarcely were they out of the room, when the faint had deepened into death; and Friedrich Wilhelm, at rest from all his labours, slept with the primeval sons of Thor.'—Vol. ii. pp. 687-90.

This is very touching and very true to nature. But Mr. Carlyle cannot let the occasion pass without a profession of his own strange faith.

"No Baresark of them, nor Odin's self, I think, was a bit of truer human stuff;—I confess his value to me, in these sad times, is rare and great. Considering the usual Histrionic, Papin's-Digester, Truculent-Charlatan and other species of 'Kings,' alone attainable for the sunk flunkey populations of an Era given up to Mammon and the worship of its own belly, what would not such a population give for a Friedrich Wilhelm, to guide it on the road *back* from Orcus a little? 'Would give,' I have written; but alas, it ought to have been '*should* give. What *they* 'would' give is too mournfully plain to me, in spite of ballotboxes: a steady and tremendous truth from the days of Barabbas downwards and upwards!—Tuesday, 31st May 1740, between one and two o'clock in the afternoon, Friedrich Wilhelm died; aged fifty-two, coming 15th August next. Same day, Friedrich his Son was proclaimed at Berlin; quilted heralds, with sound of trumpet and the like, doing what is customary on such occasions."—Vol. ii. pp. 690-91.

We must pause here, but in the hope of returning to this extraordinary book when the concluding volumes shall be published. In our present notice we have refrained from entering into what might appear properly to be the fitting subject of this article, the personal history and character of Frederick. We have already, however, sufficiently indicated the reason. Mr. Carlyle himself has as yet hardly opened the subject, or at least he has only laid the foundations, by remote indications and obscure hints, for the formal and explicit declaration of his views regarding it. It is by the acts of his own independent will that Frederick has hitherto been judged, and by these alone can his character be fairly appreciated. Up to the date at which these volumes break off, Frederick not only was not his own master, but is confessed by his biographer

to have worn a perpetual mask. The real materials for a historical judgment regarding him are yet to come, and belong to his life as king. How Mr. Carlyle will dispose of those facts on which most part of the unfavourable judgments, so long universally accepted, rests, we cannot presume to divine. For some of them, as, for example, the Appropriation of Silesia, and the dealings with Voltaire, we observe that he has already remotely begun his preparations. We shall not attempt to anticipate how the actual work of apology is to be performed. We shall only say that not one among the many apologetic suggestions with which these preparatory volumes are filled, has in the slightest degree affected our long-formed estimate of Mr. Carlyle's hero. On the contrary, we see in these volumes the germ of all the bad qualities which the sunshine of prosperity and power was not slow to develop into maturity. The boy, even as shown by his panegyrist, seems to us clearly "father to the man," such as we have long learned to know him—a calculating profligate, a heartless formalist, and a pedantic tyrant.

ART. VIII. —1. *The Times*, July 2, 1859.

2. *The Weekly Register*, July 9, 1859.

3. *The Dublin Review*, for 1854.

4. *Naples*: par Jules Gondou : London, Dolman, 1854.

5. *The Memoirs of Cardinal Pacca*. Translated by Sir F. Head. London.

6. *Gosselin's Temporal Power of the Popes*. Translated. London : Dolman.

7. *Roscoe's Life of Leo X.* Bohn's Edition. London, 1854.

8. *Ranke's Lives of the Popes*. Bohn's Edition. London, 1853.

PRINCIPLES are eternal, for truth is always *one* and the same, and does not alter with the events of time. Hence the importance of history, for it shows moral principles in action; and if its story be not truly told, the judgment is perverted. Historical truth is thus essentially associated with moral truth; and we cannot rightly judge of facts which are falsely narrated, any more than we can form a right judgment upon the facts if our principles are perverted.

Men may be misled by false views of history into calumny, or bad morality. What they are led to admire or to condemn in history, they will be ready to revere or to revile, in events and actions which are contemporary. That which they approve in the past, they will be prepared to imitate and repeat in the present. And on the other hand, the false traditions they may imbibe from history, may prevent them from doing justice to men, whose destiny it may be to be called upon to act upon the same principles as others whom we have been led to associate in our minds with ideas of depravity and iniquity.

This is pre-eminently true of princes, but, above all, of Pontiffs. For theirs has been in every age this hard fate, to have their actions judged and recorded by men naturally jealous of, if not hostile, to their authority, by laymen or ecclesiastics in the interest of lay princes. And this has been, of course, peculiarly verified of such Pontiffs as have been engaged in constant struggles with princes or nobles. But as these contests have been of a more deadly nature, and the character of their assailants vicious and unscrupulous, in the same proportion has been the virulence of the calumny to which they have been exposed.

It was on these accounts that some years ago we thought it right to devote great attention to the pontificates of certain of those Popes, against whom the complaints resolved themselves into this, that they used the sword for the recovery, or for the defence of their temporal dominions. We vindicated their conduct in that respect on the ground, not only of right, but of duty ; we maintained that every sovereign was bound to protect his subjects from a wicked and usurped tyranny. We showed that in point of right the title of the Pontiff was clear ; but we did not content ourselves with that : we showed also that their authority was usurped and grievously abused, and that it was the duty of the Pontiff, a duty from which he could not without crime have shrunk—to defend and deliver his subjects, and to vindicate his rightful sovereignty.

And our own times were, alas ! so bad, that we could not but foresee the probability of the Pope's having to vindicate his authority by force of arms, and we knew that in such a case there would be just the same outcry against him as there had been against some of his predecessors. And so it has been.

We were persuaded that, if ever it came to that, our

Holy Father, with all his benignity, would not shrink from his painful duty. We were sick of the stuff talked about that same benignity, with a kind of implied contrast to the severity of other pontiffs; we knew that one pontiff would be just as severe or just as gentle as another, according to the occasion, being certain that a Sixtus, or a Julius was not one whit less benign than Pius IX. or Gregory XVI.

In former articles on the subject of the Papal government we mentioned the fact to which Ranke calls particular attention, that while the Italian cities early enjoyed municipal privileges, they had never had, and did not appear to be fitted for what we call political institutions. This distinction was again and again illustrated in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries with regard to these very cities of Perugia and Bologna, but has been ignorantly lost sight of in much that has lately been said and written on the subject. We will illustrate this ignorance by a paragraph which we lately observed in the English organ of Italian liberalism, the *Telegraph*, professing to have been taken from a letter from Turin.

"The *Official Journal of Bologna* has just made some curious revelations. It states that several years back an advocate, M. Berni degli Antonii, found the conventions which were entered into in 1447 between the city of Bologna and Pope Nicholas V., by which the Pope recognised the rights of that city, and denounced any one who should dare to infringe them; and these conventions were ratified by twenty-seven successive Popes. When in 1815, after the cessation of the French occupation, the Pope was invested with the possession of Bologna, the senators of the city claimed its rights in virtue of the convention of 1447. Pius VII. replied that he would not refuse 'to render to Cæsar what belonged to Cæsar,' but he referred them to Cardinal Consalvi, his minister. The senators caused Antonii to present a petition to the Cardinal, and in it the advocate took care to cite the document of 1447. But the Cardinal said, 'Woe to you if you publish that document! And consider yourself lucky that you are not at once sent to the fort of San Angelo to be detained for the rest of your life for having quoted it.'"

"Curious revelations." Why they are mere matters of history, just as much so as the pretended conferences thereupon are flagrant inventions of mendacious folly. "The towns of Romagna," says Ranke, "were seized (re-seized) by Julius II., but he did not annex a single one to the Pontificate without first consenting to restrictive

conditions or conferring new and fixed rights." What were they? "When the city of Faenza" (states the historian) "placed itself under the immediate sovereignty of the Holy See, in 1463, it made certain conditions; first, that to all future time the city should hold immediately of the Papal throne; next, that it should choose its own podesta;" that is, mayor. So that the sole anxiety of the cities was to be under Papal rule. The Lutheran historian says so distinctly. "The cities dreaded being alienated from the Papal See." And all these privileges were purely municipal. "When Julius II. drove Baglioni from Perugia, he did not refuse to reinstate the peaceful magistrates, the 'priors;' " i.e. the town council. "Nor was Bologna more closely restricted; together with the forms of municipal independence, it retained many of the essential attributes," (i.e. of municipal independence,) "the administering patron of the town revenues," &c. Just as an English borough administers its own revenue, subject to the supreme sovereignty of the Queen; has a body of police under its own officers, and so forth. What has this to do with political independence? Really all that is talked and written on the subject of Italy in this country shows the grossest ignorance; ignorance of history, of government, and of the very elements of municipal and political law. Fancy referring to pretended concessions in the middle of the fifteenth century, when Ranke himself narrates they had in the next—exactly a hundred years afterwards—(the people of this very city of Perugia, having been foolishly induced to press their municipal privileges into a claim of political independence,)—been deprived of those privileges. "Their liberties," says Ranke, "entirely destroyed, and all their rights and privileges repealed, they having risen into rebellion against their legitimate sovereign, and having, according to the principles of English law, not less than by the judgment of the Apostolic See, forfeited the franchises which they had thus abused." Fancy the ignorance of your modern journalists, after all this had been matter of history for centuries, gravely referring to a portion of the facts as "curious revelations," and then, ignoring all the rest, building upon it a whole fabric of pretended inferences and invented commentaries!

The Protestant historian of Leo X., the learned and acute Roscoe, tells us that,

"Julius II., in suppressing the vicars of the Church, and in uniting their territories to the Holy See, had completed a work which Alexander VI. had begun, but without incurring an equal degree of odium to that which has been attached to the memory of his predecessor ;"

the reason being, it is obvious, that Alexander and Sixtus had the first and the worst of the work, and had to bear the brunt of the odium and obloquy of it, whereas Julius II. had partly reaped the fruit of what they had done. So of Leo X., of whom Roscoe says:—

"The dissensions which under the pontificates of Alexander VI. and Julius II., had torn the states of the Church, were at length appeased. For some years he had turned his attention towards the smaller states in the vicinity of the Roman territory, which had been seized upon by successful adventurers or were occupied by domestic tyrants, but over which the Church had always asserted its superiority, whenever an opportunity occurred of enforcing its claims."

And then the historian gives us an illustration, or an instance, of those domestic tyrants ; and, curiously enough, it appears to be the case of Perugia.

"The city of Perugia was governed by Gean Paolo Baglioni, who, if we may believe contemporary historians, was a monster of iniquity and impiety ; but the cruelty with which he exercised his usurped authority rendered him less an object of dread than his other crimes did of horror."

And in a note the historian adds, further authorities on the character of Baglioni, and on the petty tyrants who had obtained possession of different cities in Italy, whose enormities frequently afford subject for the novelists of the times. Well, the Pope resolved to put down this truculent wretch, and liberate the poor people—subjects of the Holy See—who groaned beneath his infamous tyranny. And surely in so doing the Pontiff exercised a right, but discharged a sacred duty. Surely it was an act, not of oppression, nor even of vindication, but of protection. And the Protestant historian testifies that this was the very work in which Alexander VI. had been engaged, and which he left to Julius and Leo only to complete. They did complete it ; and Roscoe bears his testimony, that to it Italy owed her pacification and her recovery of tranquillity and prosperity.

So it has been in every age, since the Popes, on their return from Avignon, found Italy a desert. To restore it

from that state, caused by their absence, was the object of all the Pontiffs since that time, until the work was accomplished under Leo. Not without bloodshed. For how can murderers be repressed without blood? And succeeding pontiffs had to struggle with other evils, as that of brigandage, equally requiring severity, for their supposed failure in which the Popes were sometimes reproached; but whether by the mildness of a Gregory, or the sternness of a Sixtus, the work was done, and Italy remained—at least the Papal States—happy and tranquil until the sad era of the French revolution which has not yet closed.

We remembered the excommunication which Pius VII., (as recorded by Cardinal Pacca,) pronounced against the power of the first Napoleon, for robbing him of his temporal dominion; we remembered also how our present Holy Father, when expelled from his dominions by traitorous subjects, proclaimed that

“The *duties of our sovereignty*, in which we cannot fail the solemn oaths with which we have, in the presence of Almighty God, promised to preserve the patrimony of the Holy See, and to transmit it, in all its integrity, to our successor, oblige us to raise our voice solemnly and before God, and in the face of the whole universe, against this gross and *sacrilegious* attempt.”

And he appealed to the Catholic powers to suppress the rebellion by force of arms.

“After the most iniquitous malversations to reward their accomplices and get rid of priests and God-fearing men—after so many assassinations committed under their guidance—after having let loose rebellion, immorality, irreligion—after having seduced the imprudent youths, desecrating even the places consecrated to public worship, by converting them into dens of most licentious soldiers, formed of runaways and criminals from foreign countries, the anarchists wished to reduce the capital of the Catholic world—the See of the Pontiff—to a sink of iniquity, destroying, if they could, all idea of sovereignty for him who is destined by Providence to govern the Universal Church, and who, in order to exercise freely his authority over all the Catholic world, enjoyed, as an estate, the patrimony of the Church. At sight of such desolations and massacres the Holy Father could not but be profoundly grieved, and at the same time moved to weep over his faithful subjects who claimed his aid and his succour to be delivered from the most atrocious tyranny.”

Here we see our Holy Father putting the resort to armed force on that ground on which the Pontiffs have

always declared it can alone be put, *defensive* ground, vindicating an appeal to the sword on the Scriptural principle, that the ruler should not wear the sword in vain, but as a terror to evil doers, and as a defence to those who do well. And we saw that if this principle were good for one age it was good for another; that it would lead Pius IX. to the same measures in the same cause as it had led his predecessors, and that it would subject him to the same outcry and the same obloquy.

Alas! subsequent events have shown that we were right. The "sacrilegious" revolutionary party have repeated their infamous attempts to subvert the temporal sovereignty of the supreme Pontiff; they have menaced and seduced several cities of the Papal States to throw off his allegiance; they have committed the same atrocities and essayed to establish their odious tyranny, and the Pontiff has adopted the same course as his predecessors, and has had recourse to arms to protect his subjects and vindicate his authority, and has, for so doing, been subjected to as much obloquy as any Pontiff has been of old.

Ever since the restoration of the Pope to his dominions, the same faction which effected his expulsion have been indefatigable in their endeavours to repeat their sacrilegious crime. Of course they have assumed to do so in the name of the "people;" and the oft-repeated fallacy so often uttered in this country is, if the people are not with them why do they meet with any success? The answer is, that they achieve some success because they have power over the people, for the same reason that a police force, or an army, have power over the general body of the inhabitants, being a compact and armed body, acting under one guidance for a common aim. But not for that reason alone. They are unscrupulous in the use of means; they are secret in their movements; they resort to assassination,* and they inspire terror by the fear of murder. Nor is this all. They have the moral sanction and material support of a neighbouring piratical state, always ready to lend them secret aid or secure them a safe retreat.

Even this is not all. They know that the government of their sovereign is hampered by peculiar causes, and brought under the *surveillances* of the two great powers, England

* Witness the murder at Velletri. (Times, Oct. 24.)

and France, ever ready to raise an outcry against the use of repressive measures, absolutely required by the state of things they themselves have helped to produce, exposed to the insidious efforts of English emissaries, or the open propagandism of English travellers, subject, above all, to the perpetual presence of French troops, provoking its own people by their parade of foreign force, and preventing the government they professed to support from freely using its authority; contaminating the population by the infection of false political principles; their very presence a perpetual incentive to that revolution of which France is the great exemplar; and, in short, provoking the Pope's subjects, by their example, to rebel; and doing so in his name!

It is not to be wondered at that in such a state of things the moment a state of revolution was proclaimed in Italy, and the French emperor gave it encouragement, and the Sardinian government was doing its utmost everywhere to stimulate the people to revolt, these baleful influences should have had their result in Romagna, and that there should have been revolts in Bologna and Perugia. This no more proves that the Papal government is bad than the riots in London, in 1786, or in Bristol, in 1832, show that England was misgoverned. No government is more firmly resolved than our own to maintain its authority, and none is more conscious that it is impossible to do so without a stern display of force. About the time when the Bourbon tyranny was tottering to its fall, the Brunswick dynasty was being established in this country, and how? By blood. Smollett tells the story, and we have had occasion to tell it again, and especially to refer to the Riot Act, one of the first acts of the first of the Brunswick parliaments; an act under which, if twelve persons refuse to disperse when ordered so to do by a magistrate, on the reading of that act, the troops may fire upon and shoot down the persons assembled, although *unarmed*, as if rebels and traitors in open arms! This hideous act has been enforced a hundred, aye, a thousand times, since it was passed, and is acted upon at almost every stormy election in this country, to this very day. Strange that in such a country, cavils and clamours should ever be heard against repressive measures abroad! Those who boast of the submission of our people to the rule of our beloved sovereign, should know that it is a submission enforced, as regards the "masses," by an imposing array of force,

either military or police. In every large town there is a regiment, or a part of one, perhaps several, besides a large body of police, ready to act as soldiers; nor is there now a single county without its police, all ready to do some military duty. In Dublin we know there are the constabulary, in itself a little army, besides a strong military force. So in every city of the empire. We do not trust to moral power to maintain our rule. We maintain peace only by a large armed force, far larger than the Papal government could afford; and we have none of those peculiar difficulties to contend with which beset that government. We should not tolerate among ourselves emissaries from Rome inciting our subjects to revolt, as we compel the Pope to tolerate Englishmen who are engaged incessantly in such work. We should make short work of such emissaries. We did so in the good old times of the penal laws. We hung them; and we ourselves have heard Lord J. Russell vindicate the conduct of our ancestors in so doing. If the Pope only imprisoned them what an outcry should we raise! Yet he is expected to allow, and, in truth, cannot prevent, thousands a-year being spent in inciting his subjects to revolt, by the circulation of tracts through his dominions, representing him as Anti-Christ, branding him as an usurper and impostor, and doing all this (with nefarious hypocrisy) under the pretence of religion. And then when a few thousands, thus seduced and debauched from their allegiance by French example or English influence, revolt from their sovereign, and raise rebellion against him, we pretend to regard this, the result of our own agency, as proof positive of Papal misgovernment!

The truth is, there never was a government in the world which has had to contend against such systematic intrigues, on the part of *every other government*, more or less to weaken, if not to subvert it. Until the Austrian Concordat this was the great object of every government in Europe, but above all of the "Great Powers," then all anti-Papal, if not avowedly anti-Catholic.

And what can the Papal Government do against such powerful and such insidious foes? What could it oppose to their artful "recommendations," intended to incite its subjects to revolt? Could it declare war? Could it excommunicate all the Catholic sovereigns of Europe? or sovereigns who never were Catholic at all? What could it do but endure? And it has had to endure more than

any other government could endure: the ceaseless intrigues of all the powers of Europe, to ruin, depress, or subvert it; perpetually laying before its subjects lures and inducements to revolt, arguments for change, reasons for revolution, enforced by the assurance of sympathy and the confidence of support. What government would suffer any other to pursue such a course towards its subjects? continually issuing manifestoes—in the form of recommendations for a change of government—calculated to make them discontented and disaffected. No other government could endure such a system ten years.

Even Lord J. Russell once allowed that the Papal government was under peculiar difficulties, owing to the circumstance that Rome was the centre of intrigues, emanating from every European nation. But this is only half the truth. The position of the Holy See is without parallel in this respect, that it is the object of the machinations both of governments and revolutionists. The princes of the world dislike it, are jealous of it; seek to cripple its spiritual authority; with that view to surround its temporal government with embarrassments; try to lower it in the eyes of its own subjects, and do all they can to incite them to revolution, under the specious pretext of desiring to prevent it! What a remedy for revolution! Perpetually parading the supposed weakness or alleged “abuses” of the government. The revolutionary party all over Europe of course heartily aid these infamous tactics, though from different motives. The end is the same, and the means. Princes and demagogues equally desire to prostrate or depress the Vicar of Christ, and with that view assail his government with systematic calumny, which no other government would tolerate or could endure.

Before entering upon an examination of the particulars of the Perugia “massacre,” let us see if our own history, and the history of our own times, do not afford ample analogies. Were we to mention the Manchester “massacre” we should be told perhaps that it was under Tory ministers, in “the good old times when George the Third was king.” But it was solemnly approved and confirmed, not only by parliament, but by the courts of law, the decisions of which, by the law of England, no man has a right to impugn, and Sir F. Burdett libeller for accusing the yeomanry of

being guilty of a "massacre." The text-books of the law of England, as last edited, lay the law down exactly in conformity with the law as then laid down, and that law has been acted upon again and again down to our own days, down to and within the last ten or twelve years. We need only take two illustrations or instances of these, the last great Repeal meeting at Dublin, and the Chartist "demonstration" of 1848. Both these might have been "massacres," and would have been, had the people ventured to resist the preparations made for their massacre.

As we are anxious upon all occasions to furnish the most unexceptionable authorities upon matters of fact, let us quote the *Quarterly Review*. (No. cxliv.) It showed the proclamation to prevent the meeting was legal, and went on thus:—"The sole objection we now hear is as to the time. The government is reproached with having too long delayed its interference, and with having interposed at last, *only twenty-four hours before the intended meeting*, so that there might not have been time to prevent the concourse of people, and that if they had assembled a great calamity might have occurred."

A great calamity, that is, a great massacre. All the preparations were made for it, and perfectly in accordance with law, at least with the letter of the law. No one, at least in England, ventured to dispute it. The meeting, it was sworn, was likely to "disturb the peace;" if so, it was legal to proclaim it, and if so, legal to provide a military power to enforce the proclamation. And so, as the *Quarterly* truly said, the sole objection was to the *time* of the proclamation. "On the very day of the proclamation," says the *Quarterly*, "Mr. O'Connell said it should be obeyed. So that if any one were speculating on the blood of the people, they would be disappointed. They did not issue their proclamation until *three o'clock on the very day* of the meeting."

And O'Connell solemnly declared, "That it was not the fault of the Government that a massacre did not take place." (*Times*, 11th October, 1843.)

Now mark how the *Quarterly* tried to meet that.

"Though even political bigotry will not believe that any mischief was premeditated, was there, in fact, no danger that the notice might be *too short*? *There certainly was*. But it was a danger created by O'Connell and his party."

That is because the repealers were to come from remote parts. As if that did not make it more necessary that the notice should be longer!

But observe how the *Quarterly* most correctly lays down the *law*. The truth is, strictly speaking, no "proclamation" before the meeting was necessary at all. The murderous Riot Act provided for that, long ago, in the first days of Whig ascendancy.

In strict law no previous notice would have been necessary; but only a magistrate on the spot to read the Riot Act. Upon which, and the neglect of the people to disperse, the troops might legally massacre them in any numbers. The issuing any proclamation at all, the *Quarterly* urged, was only a measure of humane precaution, and it accounted for the issuing of it, and for the delay, because, as to this meeting, there had been a silly announcement a few days before, that there were to be "repeal cavalry," as it was explained at once, "repealers on horseback," just as at county elections. The government professed to take alarm at this. A cavalcade of unarmed horsemen!

The argument of the *Quarterly* was, that this not only justified the suppression of the meeting, but imperatively called for a proclamation, as a measure of precaution, as a duty to humanity, to prevent the horrible massacre which would on the morrow have ensued. For the *Quarterly* did not attempt to dispute that there would have been a massacre. The only question was as to who should be responsible for its imminency—the repeal party or the government. Both parties were agreed that the danger was imminent, and that the massacre would have been, strictly speaking, legal. The *Quarterly* defied Mr. O'Connell to attack the government for the measure they had taken. Not only did he not do so, but they attacked *him*, they arrested him, they imprisoned him, they accused him of "privy conspiracy and rebellion," in concocting the meeting; they arraigned him at a criminal bar, they convicted him, and the judgment was only reversed by the House of Lords, not at all upon the substantial law or merits of the case, but solely on the shameless tampering which had taken place with the jury lists. Thus, then, we have had it settled within the last fifteen years, by the highest authorities, that a large meeting to discuss a repeal of an Act of Parliament, if the people are to be on "horse-

back," or in such numbers as even to create a fear of breach of the peace, is illegal, and may be suppressed by military force, even although the consequences are a terrible "massacre."

The other illustration was that of the Chartist 'demonstration,' in 1848. The writer was out on that occasion as a special constable. And some one else was 'out' also, no less a person than Louis Napoleon, then a resident in this country. The future Emperor had then an opportunity—which no doubt he amply improved—of studying the military tactics of a government menaced by that most formidable peril, the attack of the mob of a metropolis. Those tactics were arranged by "the Duke" himself, and they were afterwards followed by his apt pupil on the occasion of the *coup d'état* in Paris. There was a great deal of affected indignation on that latter occasion, fulminated against the French Emperor in the English press. But, with the usual onesidedness of the press in England, they totally forgot who had been his preceptor, and where and when he had received the great lesson by which he had so ably profited. The tactics of the mob on those occasions, at least of any mob with military instincts, are simple, but fearfully effectual; to embarrass the troops in streets, locked in by pavement barricades, and then murder them with perfect ease, by volleys from the windows of the houses. In order to be prepared for this fatal system, Wellington made ready to receive them. He had immense bodies of troops carefully concealed, and whom it was not his intention to expose, but who were to seize and occupy the houses in the streets, filled by the mob, and shoot them from the windows.

These tactics were much approved of afterwards, and no doubt the rumour of them at the time contributed to deter the mob from the attack. They were the only tactics likely to be effectual, and it was boasted how the Duke did not intend to expose his troops to the horrors of a street fight, but to retort those horrors on the assaulting mob themselves; place the soldiers in security, and shoot the mob down from the windows. There could not be conceived a more fearful massacre than must have ensued, had not the mere *menace* of it tempered the mob into submission; a most reluctant submission it was, on the part of dense masses of angry men, who only wanted fire-arms to dare the contest, and whose isolated acts of out-

rage with crowbars and other terrible weapons, showed what they would have done had they dared. And they who boast that the throne of Queen Victoria rests entirely on love, and not at all on fear, and that our "happy constitution" needs no aid from military force, should be simply reminded of that remarkable day when throne and constitution were only preserved by the imposing array of troops and whole parks of artillery.

Lord Palmerston is fond of comparing what occurred in London, on the 10th of April, 1848, when Louis Napoleon acted as a special constable, with the state of affairs in foreign capitals; and Rome is always made the main object of the contrast drawn.

"The hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. Bowyer) has said that the government of Rome is much maligned; that it is one of the most improving and progressive governments in existence. But I would just ask him one question.—How is it that for many years, unless foreign troops were kept in Rome to preserve order and put down discontent, the Roman government would be overthrown in a day? In 1848 this metropolis was threatened with a convulsion; but what happened? A hundred thousand of the well-disposed people armed themselves, not with daggers, pistols, and muskets, but with honest English bludgeons, and the city was nearly as peaceful on the day of the movement as on the day before, or the day after it. So it would be with Rome if it were well governed. But the existence not only of discontent, but of bitter resentment against the government and everything that belongs to it, is, I say, the most conclusive proof that Rome has not that perfect and model government which the hon. gentleman would have us believe, but that, in point of fact, as every body well knows, it has one of the very worst in the civilized world."

"As every one knows." Because every one (*i. e.*, in England) has always been told so, and knows no better. Lord Palmerston took care not to mention the masses of troops and the batteries of artillery, all so carefully lodged and masked, and prepared to massacre the masses of the people. The government knew well enough that they cared not for the hundred thousand well disposed people with English bludgeons. Besides, as the "Register" observed of it,—

"If the insubordination of the Romans, and the maintenance of order by the presence of the French troops, is conclusive evidence that the Pontifical government is 'the very worst in the civilised world,' the converse must also be true. If the Roman government must be assumed to be execrable because the people are dis-

contented, then the Neapolitan government must be the best in the world, for nowhere else are the people so loyal to their prince. Indeed, one of the calumnious charges against the late king of the Two Sicilies was, that he contemplated arming the multitude to crush his enemies. This proves, at all events, that the people were not oppressed by King Ferdinand. Will the noble lords consent to be bound by all the legitimate consequences of their dogma, that the disaffection of a people is proof demonstrative of bad government? What, then, are we to think of British rule in Ireland in 1798 and 1803, and in 1848, when a pure and undiluted Whig Ministry governed this empire?"

Are there no later illustrations? We refer to regular onslaughts on the people by the military, such as too often take place in Ireland, and are popularly called massacres, with at least as much reason as the so-called massacre of Perugia. Two instances will suffice, both within the last five years, the Sixmilebridge massacre, and the Limerick massacre, which occurred only a few months ago, about the time this outcry was being raised against the 'massacre' of Perugia.

Take the first, the Sixmilebridge affair. At an election the people, believing that some voters who were being brought up to the poll *under a military escort*, were under the moral coercion of their landlords, tried to rescue them, unarmed, and with no other means of offence than the stones which lay scattered about. The mob, in short, threw stones; the military fired, and a host of unarmed men lay dead or wounded. There was a coroner's inquest; the verdict was wilful murder; the Crown treated it with contempt, and tried to quash it; ultimately the soldiers were acquitted, and there was a *legal* end of the affair. We say a *legal* end. The law was that the military having been assailed, even though only by stones, had a right to fire in self-defence, and kill as many of the mob as they could. And the jury were directed to find not guilty, even of manslaughter. By the English law it was not even manslaughter, it was justifiable homicide. The soldiers were acting under the authority of law, they were assailed and they had a right to shoot their assailants. Such is the law of England and of Ireland, remorselessly acted upon on every occasion, even at an Irish election. What it would be in any attempt at insurrection or rebellion the opinion of the country on the conduct of the Mayor of Newport, in firing on the Chartists, will serve to show. He was made a knight of at once, to re-

ward his zeal and spirit, and the name of Sir Thomas Phillips should be a standing rebuke to those who cry out against the repressive acts of Continental governments. But the Sixmilebridge affair did not rest there. A newspaper, not satisfied, inserted the following paragraph expressive of the popular opinion about it. We insert it, with the exception of allusions to the particular regiment implicated, which were made the ground of indictment.

"The slaughter of the Irish people at Sixmilebridge, in the County of Clare, has been under investigation for several days past. It seems by all accounts, that the Clare election was of the ordinary line of closely-contested elections in Ireland. Upon the one side ranged the landlord influence, upon the other side the Priests. All parties were, of course, much excited; but it is quite apparent that no sufficient provocation was given to the soldiers to discharge their guns upon a defenceless crowd. Indeed, it has been proved by Mr. Wilson, of Belvoir, a Protestant gentleman, that the populace surrendered their sticks to him before the military entered the village. This alone would show that no attack was premeditated by the people. We trust the government will act impartially in the matter, and punish the guilty parties, whether dressed in black, red, or grey."

Now, the truth of the paragraph was not complained of, because it could not be. The Editor had a right to adopt and to uphold the verdict of the inquest. And the bare facts were indisputable. The Crown, however, laid hold of the paltry fact alluded to, which was technically libellous, and they indicted the Editor for seditious libel!

"The defendant had pleaded two pleas—first, not guilty to the whole indictment; and the second was a *plea of justification to portions* of the libel set out, and *containing the charge of wilful murder against some of the soldiers.*

"The Attorney-General stated the case for the prosecution, and entered into all the details of the Sixmilebridge tragedy.

"Witnesses connected with the Stamp Office were called to prove the publication of the alleged libel.

"Several witnesses were also examined relative to the occurrences at Sixmilebridge.

"The attested copy of the inquisition and other documents having been handed in, the case on the part of the Crown closed."

And the verdict was guilty, as it must have been after the result of the first trial at all events. For by the law of England it is not murder, but justifiable, for soldiers to fire on those who assail them. Thus, then, twice over,

in two solemn judicial proceedings, it was laid down as the law of Great Britain, that if soldiers engaged in any lawful acts, are assailed, even by stones, they may fire, and kill as many of the people as they please.

But we are not confined to hypothetical cases of massacres which might, and must have happened, had the mob resisted our military forces. We had recent instances of actual massacres perpetrated by our troops on unarmed men, under the authority of our law. We speak not of isolated instances of illegal outrage on the part of the military in our large towns. They are so numerous that we venture to say in a single year, in London alone, they far out-number all the pretended cases of 'Austrian' military oppression in Italy. And not a day passes over without some case at our police courts, attesting the ruffianism of a large portion of our soldiery. The other day we read in the *Register*—

"A party of seven or eight Grenadier Guards were proceeding along the New cut, when a costermonger, who had just opened an oyster for a customer, threw the shells into the road. This appeared to have given some offence to the soldiers, for they all at once resorted to their belts, and with the aid of the buckle ends they commenced beating the unfortunate man about the head and other parts of his body until the blood gushed forth in streams. The bystanders, seeing what was going on, went to the assistance of the poor man, but they were similarly maltreated, and it was found necessary to send for a body of police. As the latter were seen approaching, the soldiers were heard to say that they would butcher them if they attempted to touch them. The moment the police reached the military, and endeavoured to take the men into custody, the soldiers made a fearful attack on the police, and every one near, including women and children, was struck over the head and other parts of the body by the buckles and belts of the soldiers. After a desperate conflict, in which many of the police were severely wounded, three of the soldiers were captured and taken to Tower-street-station-house, but the others managed to fight so desperately that they could not be apprehended. The police constables, however, upon finding that they were unable to take the whole of the soldiers into custody, resorted to a somewhat novel expedient in order to identify their clothing, by making a mark with a piece of chalk upon their tunics. Upon going to the barracks the same morning it was ascertained that each man found with his regimentals thus marked had his belt spotted with blood. There is no doubt but the other soldiers will be given up by their commanding officers.

"We take the foregoing (says our contemporary,) from the *Globe*.

Our contemporary does not predict what effect will be produced by making known the awful state of affairs in this capital. Had such a trivial circumstance occurred in Milan, or in any other part of Italy, it would have formed the subject of innumerable telegraphic despatches and leading articles by our London contemporaries."

Very true. But at the very same time the *Times* was stating that the Austrian soldiery behaved with exemplary moderation in Italy. And if it be said that the mere presence of foreign troops is an insult and an oppression, setting aside the question whether Lombardy is more Italy than Germany,—what of Ireland, with its alien population and its English soldiery?

A later instance, and one which occurred precisely when the outcry was loudest about Perugia, was the massacre of Limerick. There had been an election, and the popular candidate, Major Gavin, had succeeded. The mob were enthusiastic, and paraded the town. Stones were thrown out of and at the house of a leading partisan of the opposite party. The constabulary (a force, we know, really military) fired upon the unarmed people, and killed and wounded a considerable number of them. And all this was deemed and declared to be perfectly legal, simply because some stones had been thrown, it was said, at the police, so that their shooting was technically in self-defence. To be quite unanswerable, as to the fact, we take the *Times* account:—

"Some few of the small broken stones in the street were flung at the windows by two or three in the crowd, and a few panes of glass were broken. Missiles were in return flung from the upper windows of the house, and the people at once entered: immediate stop was put to this mark of the indignation of those persons who foolishly wreaked their anger on this individual for voting for the Derbyite unpopular candidate. Major Gavin was considerably in advance when this occurred, and was not aware of the circumstance—it did not occupy one second, and created no sensation. The Major passed on, accompanied and followed by thousands of people, who continued cheering, and applauding, and making the welkin ring with acclamations.

"Opposite the house above referred to, a party of police (and commanded by Mr. Bell, R. M.) was drawn up at this time; as the Major, and those immediately about him were passing, missiles were thrown from the second floor, and it is said by very many that there were no stones or missiles thrown until this occurred. Stones were then thrown at the windows, and some panes of glass were broken, but no other injury was done; neither the sashes, the doors,

nor the walls, or any other portion of the house were in the slightest degree damaged. The police, then, with fixed bayonets, charged by order of Mr. Bell, a number of persons up the street, and the crowd separating in every direction, ran as rapidly as possible into the adjoining street, crying out and in the greatest possible state of alarm. The police came down the street again in a body, headed by Mr. Bell, but between the old market-house and the house there was no crowd whatever.

"At the market-cross the police were observed loading by the people down the street, who could not imagine why they did so, particularly as the streets were nearly emptied, with the exception of some twenty or thirty boys and girls who were throwing stones at Gamble's windows, some of which, it is said, fell on the police, but none of that body sustained any thing like injury. It is said that Mr. Bell read the Riot Act, and gave orders to the police to fire! To the inexpressible horror and dismay of the unfortunate people, no sooner was the word given than it was instantly obeyed! A policeman walked a few paces in front of the others, and fired. A volley was then fired by the platoon—then another—then another volley—in all about fifty shots of ball fired on a retreating, powerless, and defenceless people, many of whom had nothing whatever to do with the throwing at the windows. In a moment the scene was converted into one of utter horror and agony. A young man named Grace, a carpenter, was shot through the mouth, the ball passing through the back of the head; his fate was instant death. He was not near Gamble's, and had nothing to do with the stone throwing. He was returning to his house after his day's work—a home of sorrow and desolation which he was never destined to behold. The wounded persons were conveyed to their own residences amid the screams, curses, and lamentations of the multitude. Three men were carried to Barrington's Hospital. Grace was already dead when laid on the table of the surgery. The piercing cries of his wretched wife, who was carried out after fainting away, were echoed by the multitude, very few of whom could refrain from tears.

"Poor Grace was shot through the mouth, the ball piercing the brain. His countenance wore an expression of great anguish. The other victim, who has since died, was quite a lad, and had been shot through the abdomen. The third was wounded on the shoulder, the bullet having ploughed up the flesh very deeply; but we have not been informed as to whether the wound is very dangerous or not.

"Clohessy, the boy, aged about fourteen years, the son of a widow in Garryowen, and an apprentice to a shoemaker named Holmes, was shot through the abdomen. His agony was excruciating, and he expired last night at the hospital. His mother, in a paroxysm of grief and terror, ran to the hospital soon after the occurrence, and hearing the dreadful story, fainted in the arms of some female

friends by whom she was surrounded. John MacNamara, a fine young man, from the Island, the son of a widow, was shot through the thigh, and he is in a precarious condition in the hospital, the ball having passed through the flesh. John O'Brien, a young lad from the Green, near the Blackboy, was shot through the shoulder, and his case is a very serious one also. A fine boy, a son of Mr. Meskill, bootmaker, of Mary-street, was shot, though far distant from Gamble's house, at the opposite side of Baal's bridge, by a spent ball.

"The hospital presented a sad spectacle as the victims of this atrocious outrage lay on their beds groaning in anguish, and as the dead lay stretched in a gory shroud, the bloody evidence against this unexpected massacre. In a moment the report of the firing was heard, and people ran in all directions to the city authorities with the news. The mayor was speedily on the spot, and his Worship asked Mr. Bell, had he read the Riot Act? Mr. Bell showed a small card, and said he had read the Riot Act; he also added that he was roughly handled, but he bore no traces on his person of rough usage, neither did the police, who were questioned by sub-inspector O'Reilly as to the injuries they received, and one of them alleged that he got a stroke of a stone on the ankle, but it did not appear to maim or cause him inconvenience. Mr. Crawford, the county inspector, was soon on the spot. Several other sub-inspectors, and a large police force, and about an hour afterwards Mr. Coulston, resident magistrate, and a squadron of the third Dragoon Guards. Dr. Gore, J.P., was near the scene from the commencement. He stated that he took no part in the orders that were given to fire, and it appears that he did not. The doctor, as the evening advanced, appeared to fear more bloodshed, and energetically spoke of the necessity of sending home excited crowds at a moment that the people were quiet and orderly, brooding over the horrific scene which the city had just witnessed. About half-past eight o'clock, Major Gavin, accompanied by Dean Butler, &c., proceeded to the Irishtown, where immense crowds were yet assembled. The gallant Major expressed his deepest regret at the slaughter (as if they were dogs) of the poor men who were shot down, and appeased the wrath of the multitude by assuring them that he was determined that the blood of the poor fellows should not be shed unavenged. He besought of the people to go home, and not afford another opportunity for the re-enactment of another sanguinary tragedy. The Dean and clergy also besought of the people to retire peaceably homewards; and they proceeded home, cursing the event they had witnessed with feelings that cannot be described, and which, in all its features, is more startling and awful than the ever-to-be-remembered tragedy of Sixmile-bridge.

"We counted twelve bullet marks on the wall of one house.

"It is asserted by very many that no provocation whatever was

given for this murderous outrage ; by others it is said that the police were hit by stones, but the stones did them no injury ; and out of the entire number of police present not a man was seriously injured or incapacitated from attending to his duty. Mr. Joseph Murphy took the depositions of the poor boy, Clohessy, who stated that he was quietly coming across Baal's-bridge at the time ; that he was neither standing nor throwing stones ; that he had given no provocation ; several persons had a most narrow escape. A young man standing at his house in Mary-street was near a person who was hit with a ball as he was speaking to him. Groups of women remained till a late hour outside Barrington's Hospital, and their cries and lamentations were piteous in the extreme. At three o'clock yesterday the Mayor, Captain Gavin, Mr. Barron, R. M., Mr. Hartigan, and Mr. M'Mahon, held a court at the city Courthouse for the discharge of persons who had been taken up for rioting. The Rev. Mr. Bourke stated that during an experience of forty years he never witnessed so orderly an election as the present. There was some rioting at the election before the present ; but at this election there was none whatever, nor anything at all of the kind, and he hoped the bench would deal leniently with the few persons who were brought up. The number of persons brought up in all was only five or six, and with two exceptions the Bench discharged them with a caution. The persons convicted were Jeremiah Maunix, for throwing a policeman's cap into the river ; he was fined 5s., or seven days in goal ; and another was sentenced to a month's imprisonment for throwing stones."

What is the English law on the subject ? In the very same paper, which contained communications of the massacre of Perugia, we find the law thus laid down with reference to the massacre at Limerick, where the police, under the order of a magistrate, fired on an unarmed mob, who were merely throwing stones just after an election. The *Cork Examiner* tells us :—

— "The summer assizes for the city and county of Limerick were opened by the Right Hon. Judge Keogh and the Hon. Mr. Justice O'Brien, both of whom arrived in town, from Ennis, on the previous evening.

"Judge Keogh, in charging the grand jury, said that but for one case, to which he would have occasion to call their particular attention, he would not probably have felt it necessary to address them at any length, as the calendar contained only two or three altogether, and they were all charges of no unusual occurrence. The case to which he (Judge Keogh) particularly alluded did not appear upon the calendar ; as the accused parties were admitted to bail ; it was, however, his duty to notice it. They all must know that he referred to a serious occurrence which took place at the last city election, and

which was attended by the loss of several lives, arising out of an unfortunate collision between the people and the constabulary. 'If they were of opinion that the firing of the police was necessary to preserve their own lives or the lives of any of Her Majesty's subjects, then he (Judge Keogh) should tell them that the act was justifiable,' and that they were not bound to find a bill; but if, on a full examination of the case, they were of opinion that although violence was used, and stones thrown by the people, still that the necessity did not arise for having recourse to extreme measures, it would be their duty to find a true bill for *manslaughter*, and send the case forward for investigation against such parties as should be proved to have taken a part in the transaction. A certain amount of violence might have been necessary on the part of the police, and yet they might not be justified in resorting to extreme measures, such as the use of fire-arms. An excess of violence was not justifiable; and they would, therefore, criticise the evidence, and say whether the violence used on this occasion reached the limit when it was not possible for Mr. Bell, in the fair and legitimate discharge of his duty, and the constabulary under him, to preserve the peace of the city, and preserve their own lives, and the lives of the parties under their protection, without giving, and acting on, the order to fire.

"The jury then retired.

"The grand jury, after a lengthened deliberation, found a true bill against Mr. Bell, R. M., for manslaughter, and ignored the bill against the twenty-five police constables. The proceedings will now be transferred to Dublin, in pursuance of the writ of *certiorari*, obtained last term in the Court of Queen's Bench."

There to end, as the Sixmile-bridge affair did, in perfect impunity for all the parties implicated. So much for English law, as administered in Ireland.

We should not like to give any comments of our own upon the Limerick case, and are the less desirous of doing so, because our argument is not that it was a case of peculiar atrocity, but that it is the ordinary procedure in this country, on the very slightest provocation. Such was the judgment of our Protestant contemporaries. The "*Star*," for instance, in an able article, said—

"To be impartial, something ought to be said in reprobation of what we take the liberty of calling the election massacre at Limerick. These things happen in Ireland, but nowhere else, for nowhere else is to be found an armed constabulary patrolling the streets with loaded carbines, and stationed at vantage corners during the progress of an election. In this case the facts, as reported, afford scarcely any palliation of the criminal fury or deliberate guilt of Mr. E. G. Bell, the officer commanding the constabulary. * *

These sort of murders by authority have, however, a prescriptive impunity in Ireland. The massacre at Six-Mile Bridge at the election of 1851, although more deadly in its range, was the exemplar of this at Limerick. The perpetrators of the Six-Mile Bridge murders escaped the punishment they deserved, and that may also be the luck of Mr. Bell. But let not us, as Englishmen, continue to feel surprised, or at any rate to express it, at the deep feeling of hostility to the government and the law amongst the Irish people, seeing that the agents of the former may shoot them down in the streets without justification, and that the latter is a shield to the murderers."

Now, we are not anxious to maintain this view, for if it be not the true one, then what reliance can be placed upon the heated declamations of Italian revolutionists here or abroad, when such are the statements a moderate and temperate journal like the "*Star*," can venture to make respecting events which constantly happen at home? Either way, surely, we have shown, that people should hesitate before rashly adopting, as to the Roman government, a view of such events thus deliberately propounded of our own.

Well, now, after all this, it would seem strange, but for the pharisaical disposition of the people of this country to decry their neighbours, and thank God that they are not as other nations, even as these Papists—it would seem strange that any English journals should venture to assail any of the continental governments for repressive measures, of the very nature practised upon the least occasion or pretence of provocation at home. Yet not only our journalists, but our statesmen, striving to the utmost to keep up that pharisaical feeling, and to take advantage of it for the purpose of promoting their own political intrigues, have long been in the habit of raising an outcry against such measures on the part of foreign governments, in order to hold them up to odium as despotic. On this principle it was that a great outcry has been raised during the last ten years against the government of Naples, for dealing against a rebellious faction the very measures which the law of England allows against those who rebel against the established government. The pretence set up in excuse for this, viz. that the government measures of repression were in violation of the constitution, is simply adding calumny to hypocrisy, for it is notorious that Poerio and his companions had sought to put

down the constitution, by destroying the power of the higher elements in it. And the hypocrisy of the pretended remonstrances with Naples was made the more manifest by their having been made in unison with the French emperor, whose measures of repression are sterner than those of any government in Europe.

Here we see that mean spirit which Mr. Cobden, in his celebrated speech upon the China question, so indignantly denounced, as having influenced our policy of late years, a disposition to bully and overbear the weak, and to truckle to the strong. We dare not remonstrate with France or offer any representations on the nature of its government or its dealings with political offenders, but we try to destroy weaker governments by perpetually holding them up to obloquy. There may be peculiar reasons for this in the case of the king of Naples, with reference not only to the deadly hatred lurking in the minds of certain of our statesmen ever since he baffled them on the question of the sulphur monopoly in Sicily, and still later with reference to the events of 1848. But the real motive of all this outcry about Naples was a desire, on the part both of the French and English governments, indirectly to overawe the Papal government from exercising any repressive measures likely to be effective. The English government, of course, from its policy of bigotry, desired the destruction of the temporal government, the French desired a pretext for prolonging their occupation for its protection. Hence, up to the very time of the affair of Perugia, we find the *Times* correspondent harping on the same string as to Naples, and repeating his hundred times told tale of political offenders—whom *we* hang, or shoot, or transport—being actually imprisoned in Naples. In the meantime we know what events had occurred. The entry of the French into Italy, after the imperial pamphlet propounding a plan, of which the basis was the secularization, that is, the destruction of the Papal government. The imperial “proclamation,” inciting the Italian people to rise; the “liberation” of Lombardy, and the revolution in Tuscany, effected, as it is now notorious, by means of Sardinian emissaries, and, amidst all this, the rebellious movements of the same faction in Perugia and Bologna, aided to the utmost by the moral influence of the two great powers, France and England, whose statesmen for



years had been declaiming about the "liberation" of Italy, especially from Papal rule.

One means resorted to by them was the persisting in the insidious policy of paralyzing the Italian government, by reprobating any attempts at resistance or repression. Upon this principle of course any revolution would succeed: all that is required is a small knot of armed miscreants. Thus it was made matter of outcry against the Grand Duke of Tuscany, that he had positively contemplated resistance to revolution! Why not? The Marquis of Normanby, who had resided at Florence for many years, and knew the duke's character, wrote thus in the *Times*, as to the "accusation" against him, that he had meant to "bombard" Florence.

"This charge rests merely upon the existence of a detailed strategic plan, made by the general many months before, describing progressive military measures for the defence of the royal authority, if attacked by open insurrection—one of the ultimate measures to be resorted to in case of extreme necessity for the use of cannon. Since successful revolution or vigorous resistance to it has become unfortunately the normal state of so many capitals of Europe, I believe there are few where such programmes of defence do not exist. I have had but too much ocular experience of revolutions. I witnessed those desperate conflicts in the streets of Paris in the days of June, when anarchy and spoliation were only averted by the free use of cannon on the part of the Republican authorities; and the next year the royal authority at Genoa was only maintained by the most energetic measures on the part of General La Marmora, the present Prime Minister of Sardinia, who by those means procured the capitulation of the insurgents. Demonstrations sometimes save bloodshed. We had ourselves an abortive attempt at revolution in 1848; but because the Duke of Wellington placed cannon to defend the passage of London-bridge, no one ever imputed to him an intention to bombard London."

It is worth dwelling for a little on the case of Naples. The king was reviled for firing upon the insurgents in 1848, yet he had native troops, and it was admitted that the bulk of the people were in his favour. And what is the plain truth about that event?

The plain truth is, that Naples and Austria were disliked for their maintenance of the Pope, which was sincere, and not from policy, but from piety; whereas the pretended support of France was treacherous, and solely for purposes of expediency. This the English people knew and condemned, but it could not forgive monarchs who were sincerely attached to the Papacy.

That great authority on Italian history, Dr. Bowyer, has told us:—

“Poerio was forced upon the king at a time of disturbance, and held for two months the office of director of police at Naples. Afterwards he was tried and convicted of conspiracy. This is the whole history of the person who has been magnified into a statesman, and a patriot of the first class—by being confounded with the deceased Poerio, the orator of the parliament in 1821. I entirely disbelieve the stories of the cruelties inflicted upon him, because I have the evidence of trustworthy persons that those stories are untrue. And I know that Montesarchio—of which we have heard so much—where Poerio, Settembrini, &c., were confined, is not a ‘loathsome dungeon,’ but a house belonging to the Marquis del Vasto, and sold by him to the government. But at any rate those men were convicted of treason, and we must remember that the English government showed no tenderness to Mr. Smith O’Brien, and that in the Ionian Islands, under the Lord High Commissioner Ward, that government flogged, shot, and hanged numbers of Greek patriots for resisting its authority.

“As to the untimely end of the Neapolitan constitution, the fact is, that it was destroyed, not by the king, but by the revolutionary party, who had got the upper hand in the Chamber of Deputies. On the day before the meeting of Parliament the Deputies met, and demanded the abolition of the Upper House. The king refused to accede to their demand, and then barricades were raised in the streets, and the Deputies declared themselves permanent, the clubs assembled, and a revolution would have taken place if the king had not ordered the troops to clear the streets. It was not to be expected that the king should submit quietly to be dethroned. He threw himself on his army, and acted with the same courage and presence of mind which he showed when Milano attempted to assassinate him. Of course it would have been absurd to go on with the ‘Constitution’ which had committed this, and the king very wisely did not attempt it. The experiment had failed. This is in substance the true story of the explanation of the Constitution.”

So it is actually made matter of “charge” against an Italian prince, that he proposes to use military force, even of his own native Italian troops, to repress insurrection. They were corrupted, and revolted; but he was reviled for having reckoned on their doing their duty. No one reproaches him with cruelty or oppression; all the world knows his rule was mild and paternal. Thus, then, the revolt of native troops is no proof of misrule. And then the Duke of Tuscany being reviled for proposing to use native troops, who revolted, the Pope is reviled for using

foreign troops likely to prove more faithful. Upon this plea the French and English governments were doing their utmost to deprive the Pope of any such resources. The French government induced the Swiss to revolt, both from the King of Naples and the Pope, and the English government prevented the Pontiff from obtaining the aid of Spanish forces.

All this while let it not be forgotten that the intrigues of these governments, and of Sardinia, so far perverted a great part of the native population of the Roman States, as to predispose them to rebellion, and thus prevent the Pope from relying on their support for those vigorous measures of resistance which alone could repress the machinations of bands of armed conspirators, emboldened by foreign support, and secure of a safe retreat. It is not to be wondered at that under such circumstances one or two cities of the Papal States should have fallen a prey to these machinations. The marvel is how any should have escaped a similar result. No other government, we repeat, ever did or could endure such a system of insidious aggression. Bologna and Perugia revolted, or rather they fell under the influence of the very faction which seized upon municipal power, and established a reign of terror, and then pretended, in the name of those cities, to throw off the Papal Government.

The revolt of Perugia followed that of Bologna, and we desire to direct attention to a remarkable document which appeared in the *Tablet*, an "authentic though not official" statement of the Papal Government, as to important circumstances connected with the present revolution. It will seem to explain how these 'revolts' occurred, and how little they had to do with any real movement of the body of the inhabitants, still less with any weakness or want of due efficiency on the part of the Papal Government. The plain truth is that it was betrayed and taken by surprise.

"There are not wanting those who accuse the Pontifical Government of want of foresight in keeping the city of Bologna so scantily supplied with Papal troops as to leave it in the power of the factious when the Austrians departed on the night of the 11th of June.

"I will supply you with some notes and considerations which will put you in a position to form a judgment on that event.

"In the month of May, as the incidents of war followed one another rapidly, the Pontifical Government made a formal

enquiry of the Austrian Government, if it was at all possible that the Imperial forces might quit Bologna without allowing time for the entrance of a Pontifical garrison. If the answer had left a shadow of doubt, the Government would not have lost a moment in placing itself on its guard in the best manner with its own means.

"But the reply from Vienna was clear and precise, viz., *that that event should never by any means come to pass.*

"On account of this assurance, so explicit, but with which the fact did not afterwards correspond, the Pontifical Government was taken unawares at the moment of the greatest danger.

"The departure of the Austrians ensued, preceded by a few hours' warning, while in Bologna there were scarcely men enough for the police service and the custody of the prisoners.

"The Austrian Government's proceeding is without excuse. As it had given, a little before, such ample assurances, the Pontifical Government had a right to expect before the departure a warning, accompanied by a proper allowance of time. A precipitate departure was equivalent to a revolution. It is true that their departure was urged on them in all possible ways."

The Papal Government was abandoned by the Austrian Government and betrayed by the French.

"Prince Napoleon, Commander of the 5th Corps, kept on the borders of the Filigave, at one march from Bologna, a body of rebel Tuscan troops, which were continually exciting the Bolognese to attack the Austrians, with a promise of help.

"Vain were all the remonstrances made to obtain the removal of the danger. Moreover, other similar detachments were stationed at Marradi, above Faenza; at Terra del Sole, above Forli; at Avezzo, above Perugia; those positions being purposely selected which might be most troublesome to the quiet of the Pontifical provinces.

"The Corps near the Filigave was visited by Prince Napoleon a little before the Bolognese Revolution. Arms were introduced from this quarter for the Revolutionists. Without doubt the contact with these troops was most efficacious in keeping Romagna in ferment, and in promoting and favouring the desertion of the Pontifical soldiery, in corrupting whom much money was expended.

"But, since order was still upheld, recourse was had to other expedients. A French vessel of war presented itself at Rimini, as if to lay in provisions, but officials landed, there was a dinner on the part of the Consul, excitement on the part of the people, and seditious cries. Was it with a view of loyally respecting the Pontifical neutrality that the line of communication between Ancona and Bologna was thus disturbed? Shortly after, another French vessel of war repaired to Ancona, where, after firing a gun, it de-

manded information, inquiring how many Austrians were there, if they were constructing fortifications, if they paid the workmen, if they oppressed the country, if they would have permitted that vessel to enter the harbour. Being informed that on this last point it was not possible to know the mind of the Austrian General, it departed, saying that it would come again. Of this occurrence also the Austrians complained as a fresh threat against their position already sufficiently difficult and isolated.

"He would indeed be simple who did not see that these acts had for their object to determine the departure of the Austrians, although after the incitements which for several months had been given to the people, a revolutionary movement would have been the inevitable consequence. But there is no need of conjectures when the report itself of Prince Napoleon says:—'The march of the 5th Corps, ready to fall upon the Austrian army, impressed it with such serious alarm, that the Battle of Magenta had scarcely been fought before it hastened to abandon Ancona, Bologna, and the other positions on the right bank of the Po.' The Prince had gained one of his ends.

"Without, therefore, excusing the Austrians as to their mode of departure, it is certain that, far from being able to reckon on a neutrality which France respected only in words, all possible means were employed by the French, both on the land frontier and the seaboard, to speed the departure of the Austrians.

"From what has been said, reason with yourself to whom belongs the prime responsibility of that event and of its consequences."

Observe how plainly the Papal Government exposes the real object in view, and traces the machinations for it up to the "Conferences of Paris."

"In one word, the design was to get the Papal States in pledge so as to constrain the Holy Father to concessions which clashed with his duties. A threat to this effect was made, as if by design, in the famous Conferences of Paris. Now the pledge has been seized by force, and it is under this pressure that laws are imposed upon the Pope. And yet these acts are accompanied by the amplest protests of devotion. But those who do not allow themselves to be caught by words, and make use of the Divine gift of reason, know well how such behaviour is to be described. And if to the fact of the rebellion of the Romagna you add the articles of About, inserted in the Paris *Moniteur*, his book, prohibited indeed, but plentifully introduced into France, together with the signal audacity of Pepoli at Bologna, in calumniating the Pontifical Administration, the principal part taken by him and others of the Napoleon family in the recent revolution, and the absence of disapproval of their work—if, I say, you put all this together, you will see that the veil which covers a certain policy is sufficiently trans-

parent to the eyes of all Catholics to make any further arguments unnecessary to the formation of a sound judgment."

There is a tone of mild dignity and of wise reserve about this document which guarantee the truth of what the Tablet tells us, "that it may be considered by our readers as an authentic though not official statement of the Pope's government of important circumstances connected with the present revolution." Well does the Tablet add:—"By his act and deed, as well as by the aid and connivance of the French emperor, the dominions of the Sovereign Pontiff are withheld from him as a pledge or 'material guarantee' for extorting from him concessions repugnant to his duties, (che repugnano a suoi doveri)." This explains retrospectively the "revolts" of "Bologna and Perugia." The insurgents would not have dared to venture on such acts but for the support of Sardinia, nor would Sardinia have ventured on such support had she not felt sure of the the secret assent and tacit support of France. The Times correspondent has told us:

"The Duke de Gramont had an interview with the Pope, and frequent conferences with Cardinal Antonelli. This latter repeatedly endeavoured to discuss with the French ambassador the projects of reform contemplated by the Pontifical government, but the Duke evaded the subject, thinking all such schemes both insincere and impracticable. He insists on the separation of the government of the Legations, a point which the Cardinal positively refuses to give up. Hence a certain coldness in the further intercourse between the Papal court and the French envoy. The Pope loudly complains that it is mental anguish, and not physical suffering, which is killing him."

Here we had the French ambassador trying to reap the fruits of the insidious policy which had led to these revolts, and then seeking to use them as arguments for a suicidal abnegation by the Papal government of the rights and duties of sovereignty. Its subjects secretly incited to revolt, in order that it might be said, "See, your subjects dislike your rule—surrender it."

The state of things which preceded and accompanied these revolts, is well described in the *Register*.

"Mazzini behind the scenes, and Garibaldi and Mezzacapo in the foreground, with their ragged army of 50,000 miscellaneous ruffians, powerless against a real force, but of redoubted valour against priests, nuns, and peaceful citizens, hold sway. Their mission is not precisely to fight either the Austrians, or the French, or

the troops of the Holy Father. At Parma, under the prudent management of Signor Farini, they escorted the Piedmontese Commissioners from house to house to witness the registration of each inhabitant, and his attestation, by signature of his unbiassed vote. At Florence their presence was found extremely useful to carry into effect that salutary law of 1848, which, by the unexceptionable testimony of M. Guerazzi, we learn was the other day brought to bear on the elections so as to exclude from the suffrage the greater part of the population. At Modena their weight was necessary to enable a vote of 4,000 electors out of an electoral register of 72,000 to pass as the unanimous voice of the people. At Bologna a similar result has been wrought out, and although details are as yet wanting, we are justified in supposing from the above examples that it is of the same character, and wrought by the same means."

So in Perugia. No one who considers impartially the antecedents of the revolt could fairly profess to believe that it was really the free act of the majority. As the *Register* remarked.

"The intervention which has now become a matter only of time, will assume the character of a deliverance, and a protection to the great, well-disposed majority against the tyranny of the turbulent minority and of foreigners."

So thought the Holy See. So it judged and so it declared, before any measures of restoration were resorted to. What the judgment of the Holy See was upon the events which happened at Perugia and Bologna, the world had ample opportunity of knowing. On the 18th of June the Holy Father, in his Encyclical Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic world, spoke as follows:

"The seditious movement which has lately broken out in Italy, against the authority of the legitimate Princes, has passed like a flame of fire from the States adjoining our Pontifical Dominions, even into some of Our provinces. Moved by the sad example of others, and excited by foreign influence, these provinces have withdrawn from Our paternal rule, and at the instigation of a few, have even sought to place themselves under that Italian Government, which during these last years has shown itself the enemy of the legitimate rights of the Church and of her Sacred Ministers. While We reprobate and grieve for these acts of rebellion, by which a part only of the people in those disturbed provinces so unjustly corresponded to Our fatherly solicitude and care, and while We openly declare that the 'civil power is necessary to this Holy See, in order that without impediment it may exercise its sacred authority for the good of religion,' (which civil power the crafty ene-

mies of the Church of Christ endeavour to tear away;) to you, Venerable Brethren, We have recourse by letter, that We may find some comfort for Our grief."

And then the Holy Father exhorted them by their zeal "for the Apostolic See, *and its liberty*," to exert their influence and their intercessions on its behalf.

"For the rest we openly declare, that clothed with strength from on high, which Almighty God, moved by the prayers of the faithful, will grant us in our weakness, we are ready to undergo every danger and every bitterness rather than abandon in the least part our Apostolic duty, or permit anything to be done contrary to the sanctity of the oath by which we bound ourselves, when, God so willing, we mounted, although unworthy, this Supreme Chair of the Prince of the Apostles, the rock and defence of the Catholic faith."

Here was a clear and decided emanation of the great principle on which, as the readers of this Journal have so often been reminded, the sanctity of the Holy See's temporal dominion rests, viz., the necessity of it, for the sake of the liberty of the Holy See, and its freedom and independence in the exercise of its spiritual authority.

But this was not all. There followed the Allocution of our most Holy Lord Pius IX., by divine Providence Pope, delivered in the Secret Consistory, on the 20th day of June, 1859.

"Venerable Brethren,—To the grievous sorrow, by which in common with all good men, we feel ourselves oppressed at the thought of the war which has broken out between Catholic nations, has now been added another exceeding great sorrow by reason of the sad changes and disturbances, which, by the wicked endeavours and most sacrilegious daring of impious men, have lately taken place in certain provinces of our Pontifical dominions. You will understand, venerable brethren, that we allude with sorrow to that wicked conspiracy and rebellion against our sacred and legitimate civil power, and that of this Holy See, a conspiracy and rebellion which certain abandoned inhabitants of those same provinces have not feared to promote and bring about by means of secret and unlawful assemblies, base compacts made with the inhabitants of neighbouring states, fraudulent and calumnious writings, arms provided and obtained from beyond our states, and by many other deceitful ways.

"Nor can we refrain from lamenting that this hateful conspiracy broke out first of all in that our city of Bologna, which adorned with favours by our paternal benevolence and liberality, two years ago when we were dwelling there, did not omit to show

forth its veneration to our person, and to this Holy See. It was at Bologna on the 12th day of this month, that after the Austrian forces had unexpectedly retired, the boldest of the conspirators, without any delay, trampling underfoot every divine and human law, and loosing the rein to injustice, feared not to create a tumult, to arm, assemble together, and lead out the Urban Guard and others, to repair to the palace of our Cardinal Legate, and there to remove the Pontifical arms, and to place in their stead the standard of rebellion, to the great indignation and amidst the murmurs of the better citizens, who were not afraid to manifest their reprobation of so great a crime, and their applause of our Pontifical government.

"The rebels then announced to our Cardinal Legate that he must leave the city, who, in accordance with the duty imposed on him by his office, did not forget to oppose such wicked attempts, and to uphold and defend our dignity and rights, and those of this Holy See. And to so great a height of wickedness and shamelessness did the rebels come at last, that they did not fear even to change the Government and demand the Dictatorship of the King of Sardinia, and for this purpose to send a deputation to the same King. When, therefore our Legate could no longer resist such injustice, or be spectator of it, he published both by word of mouth and in writing, a solemn protest against all that had been done by this faction to the injury of our rights and those of this Holy See, and compelled to leave Bologna, he retired to Ferrara.

"The same evil deeds which had been brought about at Bologna, were also to the general sorrow of all the good, committed in the same criminal way at Ravenna, Perugia, and elsewhere, by abandoned men, who trusted that our Pontifical troops, not being in a condition, from the smallness of numbers, to resist their audacity, would be unable to repress their attacks. Hence, we have seen that in these cities the rebels have trampled underfoot every divine and human authority, have attacked our supreme civil power and that of this Holy See, have raised the standards of rebellion, have removed the legitimate Pontifical Government, have invoked the Dictatorship of the King of Sardinia, have induced or compelled our delegates to leave, after publicly protesting, and have committed many other acts of rebellion."

The allocution proceeds to lay down the doctrine of the temporal dominion, and to denounce the motives of those who propose under such specious pretexts, to destroy it.

The *obligation* on the Holy See to maintain its dominion is thus clearly set forth.

"Wherefore, being bound by the office of our Apostolic Ministry, and by solemn oath to provide with the utmost vigilance for the safety of religion, and to defend the rights and possessions of the

Roman Church in all their integrity and inviolability, as well as to uphold and vindicate the liberty of this Holy See—which liberty is manifestly bound up with the usefulness of the whole Catholic Church,—and, therefore, to defend the principality committed by Divine Providence to the Roman Pontiff for the free exercise of their primacy over the whole world, and to transmit it whole and inviolate to our successors ; for these reasons we cannot but condemn, reprobate, and forcibly resist the wicked and hateful attempts of these rebellious subjects.”

Nor was this all. Excommunication was solemnly denounced against all who were in Romagna or *elsewhere*, at all implicated in this rebellion.

“ Therefore, after having condemned and reprobated the violent attacks of these rebels in a note of protest, sent by our Cardinal Secretary of State to all the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargé’s d’Affaires of foreign nations, accredited to us and this Holy See, now, in the midst of this your illustrious assembly, Venerable Brethren, we lift up our voice with the utmost vehemence of our soul, and protest once more against all that the rebels have dared to do in the above-mentioned places ; ‘ and by our supreme authority we condemn, reprobate, annul, and abolish all and each of the acts in any way committed, whether at Bologna, or Ravenna, or Perugia, or elsewhere, against our sacred and legitimate Government, and the principality of the Holy See ; and we declare and decree that such acts are altogether null, unlawful, and sacrilegious.’ Moreover, we recall to the memory of all, the greater excommunication, and the other ecclesiastical pains and censures inflicted by the sacred Canons, the Apostolic Constitutions, and the decrees of General Councils, especially that of Trent (sess. 22, cap. 11, de Reform), censures to be incurred without any other declaration by all who in any way dare to attack the temporal power of the Roman Pontiff. And, furthermore, ‘ we declare that these censures have been unhappily incurred by all those who, at Bologna, Ravenna, Perugia, and elsewhere, have dared by assistance, counsel, consent, or in any other way whatsoever, to violate, disturb, and usurp the power and jurisdiction of this Holy See, and the patrimony of the blessed Peter.’ ”

Thus, then, all who in Italy, or elsewhere, aided or incited these acts, were declared to have incurred the awful penalties of excommunication.

“ But while by reason of our office we have been compelled, not without great pain of mind, to declare and promulgate these things, we nevertheless weep over the unhappy blindness of so many of our children, and cease not humbly and earnestly to implore the most clement Father of Mercies to grant by His almighty power, that soon the wished-for day may dawn, on which

we may see these Our children repent and return to their duty ; and may receive them again with joy to Our fatherly bosom, and may behold troubles removed far away, and order and tranquillity restored in all Our Pontifical States. Supported by this confidence in God, We are also comforted by the hope that the Princes of Europe, as in times past so also now, with one accord and with common counsel will lend their assistance in defending and preserving in its integrity this our temporal principality, and that of this Holy See ; seeing that it is greatly to the interest of each one among them, that the Roman Pontiff should enjoy the fullest liberty, in order that he may be able to provide for the tranquillity of conscience of the Catholic inhabitants of these states. And this Our hope is the more confirmed, because the French armies now in Italy, 'according to that which Our most dear Son in Christ the Emperor of the French has declared to Us,' not only will do nothing contrary to Our temporal power and that of this Holy See, but will even defend and preserve it."

"According to that which he has declared unto us." Mark the benign wisdom and charity of the Supreme Pontiff, illustrating that beautiful union of the courage of the lion and the meekness of the lamb, of the sagacity of the serpent with the gentleness of the dove, which have always characterized the Holy See.

We are happy to say that this solemn warning was not lost upon the French Emperor. Immediately we read,

"The *Siècle* publishes a '*communiqué*' from the Ministry of the Interior, which says that 'that journal, in attacking the political power and dogmas of the Papacy, confounds Italian independence with revolution, that the Government of the Emperor protests against this confusion, that respect and protection of the Papacy are part of the programme of the Emperor, that if a grievous conflict has taken place at Perugia the responsibility rests on those who forced it on the Pontifical Government, and that political independence and spiritual sovereignty united in the Papacy render it doubly respectable. The language of the *Siècle* might,' it is added, 'have been repressed by legal measures, but the Government prefers to deliver it to the bar of public opinion.'"

So that, following hard upon the solemn judgment of the Supreme Pontiff, we have the deliberate opinion of the French Emperor pronounced, it is fair to say, at no small peril to himself, so far as regarded the infamous revolutionary party, who instantly, fired with rage, menaced a renewal of their old policy of assassination. For at the same time we read :

"The *Liberals* in Rome are now literally at daggers drawn with

the French General de Goyon, since, a few days after the publication of the imperial proclamation had been stuck up on the walls in Rome, the chiefs of the movement went to him to inform him of their intention to manifest also their legitimate wishes by setting up the Italian flag, and proclaiming war against Austria. The General told them he had been commissioned to maintain order in Rome, and that he would order all political manifestation to be fired upon. The poor General now receives anonymous letters, threatening him with assassination, and caricatures of the Emperor with a dagger through his neck, or his own portrait with a clerical hat."—*Gazette de Liege*.

Such the weapon of the 'liberal' party; such the symbol of their foul creed—the dagger. Such their sole argument, an appeal to fear, the reign of terror, the dread of assassination. If such their audacity even in Rome, if such their attempts to inspire with terror even the General of the French Emperor, we can judge how the accursed crew would carry on their tyranny of terror at Bologna and Perugia, where they were not only uncontrolled by armed force, but secretly stimulated and aided by the resources of a neighbouring state. It was from that tyranny the Holy Father, the Sovereign of the Papal States, had essayed to rescue his loyal subjects. If it be asked why they did not protect themselves, the answer is, that a handful of miscreants, banded together by secret oaths, known to each other but to no one else, carrying on their machinations in obscurity, striking down their victims in the dark, following a hideous system of cowardly assassination, can keep in terror a whole city; and if they have in a neighbouring state, sympathy and safety, they can scarcely be suppressed, and the dread of their power will grow with their impunity until it attains the measure of an odious tyranny.

The Register, in a few expressive and emphatic words, described the state of things just after the peace.

"All Italy is in revolution, and how is the revolution to be got under? Louis Napoleon has not deposed the Pope, nor has he sequestered his dominions, as was fondly hoped at first. He has not triumphed over Austria, nor has he expelled the Austrians from Italy. But after all, he has given the revolution a greater lift than any living man; and if he has quitted Italy, he only left it as an incendiary who had done his work. He has left the burning house because he found that it became too hot to hold him, but he has left the house on fire. And the fire is still spreading, and

it is quite uncertain whether it can be subdued. The Papal States and Tuscany, the Duchies of Parma and Modena, may yet console Garibaldi, Kossuth and Mazzini, Palmerston, Russell and Cavour, by persistence in rebellion, and by the expulsion or the decimation of the clergy."

Exactly so. Place any other government in the position in which the Papal Government was placed by these events, and the same results will ensue. It is not to be wondered at that Bologna and Perugia should under such circumstances fall into the hands of the revolutionists. At that very time a despatch from the British Minister for Foreign Affairs, was published, in which he spoke of the "mis-government" of Bologna, of which he has never said anything which proves that he has any knowledge at all on the subject.

That this Sardinian Government really brought about this same revolution in Tuscany is surely an undeniable fact, after the public testimony of British Peers, such as Lord Normanby, Lord Howden, and Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, all noblemen engaged in diplomatic affairs, and necessarily well informed on such a subject. The latter nobleman thus gave his testimony in the face of Parliament:

"He believed it was impossible not to come to the conclusion that the representative of the King of Sardinia in Tuscany had been engaged in bringing about the revolutionary movement in that country; and he maintained that if the Grand Duke of Tuscany had continued in power, and had hanged that minister, he would have been perfectly justified in adopting even that extreme course. He felt persuaded that that would have been the fate of any foreign minister who should have so acted in England during the rule of Oliver Cromwell."

No doubt, as Sardinia was far stronger than the Dukedoms, and was sure of the support of England and France, and the Dukedoms and governments of Central Italy were too weak to adopt such a course as the ruler of a powerful state like England would have taken. But the moral justice of the case is the same as if they were strong enough to enforce it. And what holds good of Tuscany holds equally of Romagna. After what has been disclosed who can doubt that it does?

Directly after the peace the King of Sardinia "signed a decree, by which the Sardinian 'law respecting the press was extended to Lombardy.' That law, says the

Register, professedly enacted to last only during the war, 'was an aggravation of governmental repressive powers which already had borne with crushing severity on all thinkers and writers, whether conservative or democratic, who ever seriously opposed the existing administration. At this very moment it is endeavouring to crush the only Catholic journal of Turin. And then we find that the proclamation went on to announce the resolution of the government to organize the National Guard in every commune for the preservation of 'order:' that is, the dominant party would arm its adherents at the public expense, for the purpose of maintaining itself in power. This is the great reliance of that variety of constitutionalism which is forced in the hotbed of revolution."

Nodoubt, here we see the whole rise and progress of revolution; coercion, suppression of adverse opinion. A reign of terror, an armed force and a frantic press on the side of revolution, its opponents gagged and disarmed.

This, let it be recollected, was found easy enough when the Franco-Sardinian army had entered Lombardy, and the French legions were in Tuscany. It is easy for a faction to obtain supremacy under the cover of powerful armies. If the people of Romagna and Tuscany were indeed so determined to be "free," what need of levies in Lombardy to enable them to be so? The correspondent of the *Télégraph*, writing at Milan, said:

"It appears that the Papal Government are moving heaven and earth to beat up troops from every quarter, no matter who or what they may be, assassins, highwaymen, rogues, and vagabonds from every part of the southern mountains of the Papal dominion in order to let these desperadoes loose upon the brave little army of Garibaldi and Fanti;"—

Of course he assumed that it is only 'rogues' who would defend the Pope. But it is to be noticed, that, at all events they are Roman rogues. They are rogues from the Papal States. But how about the "brave little army" of Garibaldi? Where does that come from?

What manner of men the Italian revolutionists are has been shown for the hundredth time within the last ten years, by the assassination of Count Anviti. It is impudent to represent this dastardly deed as unusual, or one for which they are not responsible. On the contrary, it is their immemorial policy. Surely the mere mention of

Count Rossi, of Orsini, and of the other assassinations just before the war, would suffice to show this. But in fact the murder of Anviti implicates the whole liberal party, for they were in authority, and if they did not direct the deed, connived at it. This is plain from the account given by the revolutionary papers. Take for example the *Siecle*.

"He was arrested by order of the authorities, and placed in custody of two carbineers to be conveyed to Piacenza. On arriving at the railway station at Parma, these men resolved to make a halt, and took him to the barracks of the carbineers. To reach them they had to pass through the greater part of the town; and on the way the brother of a man named Carini, who had been hanged in prison by order of Anviti, and had himself received the bastinado, recognised him, and loudly expressed indignation. A crowd assembled, but the carbineers succeeded in lodging their prisoner in the guard-house. A number of the crowd, amounting to about thirty, attacked the guard-house in spite of the remonstrances of some respectable persons; the door was forced open, and the wretched Anviti was killed by stabs from poniards. His dead body was then dragged to the principal square, and there the head was cut off and placed on the top of a column. Afterwards, horrible to relate, the body, for the space of two hours was dragged about the streets. The assassination was accomplished so promptly, that it was impossible to prevent it. The band which dragged about the body was not numerous, and it is to be regretted that the National Guard did not sooner put an end to the dreadful scene."

"It is to be regretted." Why they must have connived at the dreadful scene. The crowd were only about thirty. Fancy a party of thirty attacking an English or French guard-house! Two or three soldiers, with the will, would have kept them at bay for an hour. Half-a-dozen would have routed them. How came the poor man to be "arrested by the authorities?" What instructions did the "authorities" give? How came the guard to "resolve to take him to the barracks," to reach which they "had to pass through the greater part of the town," if not to afford an opportunity for his being recognized? How came the 'barracks' to be so weak as not to resist a party of thirty men without firearms? How came "the authorities" to institute no proceedings until a week had elapsed, and the French Emperor had sternly interposed? Who can doubt that there was connivance, or cowardly weakness on the part of "the authorities?" Connivance, or cowardly weakness, we care not which. Either is fatal

to the character of the liberal or revolutionary "government." If they were free from the guilt of connivance, and are so wretchedly weak that they cannot resist a small party of thirty assassins, what becomes of the pretences, as we say, false and fraudulent, under which they have usurped the appearance of a government? As we say, they have usurped the appearances only, and by the help of such senseless but pitiless gangs of assassins. And if indeed, they had no share in this horrid crime, then our view of the revolutionary *regime*, is proved to be the true one, viz., that it is the work of a 'faction,' acting under the secret support of a foreign government, and under cover of a reign of terror kept up by a compact band of assassins. As to the excuses so shamelessly set up for this horrible assassination by the English liberal press, they only show that the liberal or revolutionary party are everywhere so morally perverted as to have a secret sympathy even for such crimes when committed in the cause of liberalism or revolution. That the victim was hated by those who had suffered from his severities is true enough, but that does not show that his severities were unjust; on the contrary, the only specific fact stated tends to show that they were just. For it is stated of one of the assassins that he was brother to a man who had been shot for an attempt at assassination. But the truth is, the assassination itself is the best vindication of the motive. For is it not rather an honour that he should have earned the deadly hatred of such miscreants? And it only serves to show how men's morals are perverted by 'liberalism' which would make excuses for assassination, or seem to consider the assassination its own excuse. How would an English governor fare at the hands of a gang of escaped convicts?

Soon after the murder of Anviti, the truth began to appear in the "Times" Italian correspondence, as follows:

"The Duchies, unlike Tuscany, have been for the last three or four months altogether in the hands of the mob, and under the rule of the extreme Red party. The people, however, or, I may say, the populace, remained in possession of all real power; for, as I have often told you, under the plea of organising a National Guard, the worst rabble in Parma seized hold of the muskets they found in the citadel, and from 3,000 to 5,000 desperadoes

may at any moment turn out armed either with guns, or at least with knives and pistols."

Here we see the whole history of these so-called revolutions.

"Among these ruffians the hatred and thirst for revenge against the agents of the late Ducal government rankle deep and intense. They had hitherto obeyed that instinct of order to which Italy clings for existence."

We have heard a good deal about the tranquillity of Italy under the revolutionary regime. Signor Azeglio, "an historian," testified to it. Let us see what kind of "peace and order" reigned:—

"Their hostile demonstrations had been limited to the burning of immense straw pig-tails under the windows of incorrigible *codini* or retrogradists; and to a few blows administered to some of the partisans of the late government, who had too freely expressed their opinions on the present state of affairs. Not a drop of blood had been shed, and we had nothing amounting to disorder to deplore! Several of the worst minions and satellites of the Ducal government had, indeed, either fallen into the hands of the mob, or had by these latter been hunted out of their hiding places in town and country; but the mob, acting as a most sensible and well-behaved Christian multitude, had always been satisfied with the arrest of these obnoxious persons, and, with little or no rough usage, had handed them over to the legal authorities, to be dealt with according to justice."

Hoping that the new rulers would cause them to be condemned under colour of law. For what?

This correspondent proceeds to say:

"One magistrate, for instance, was charged with pronouncing, against conscience, an iniquitous sentence; another with bearing false-witness in a case in which no man was able to prove his prevarication, &c. The Courts, in short, found there was no legal ground for proceeding; and the government, instead of proclaiming this plain honest truth to the incensed multitude, baffled them of their revenge, by secretly smuggling the unconvicted offenders out of the town and country."

That is to say, the revolutionary faction were quiet so long as they hoped that their tools, who aped the functions of government, would do their bloody work.

"The people, however, were not to be balked of their vengeance."

Again, what were the so-called "National Guard," the strength of the revolutionary party in Parma, or the

Romagna? The "Times" correspondent, in the same letter, tells us that they were "a loose set,"—"ruffians"—"riffraff."

"The forces in Parma on the fatal evening of Anviti's assassination were the 1,200 volunteers of the Parma brigade, a loose set, not a few of whom were conspicuous among the perpetrators of the bloody deed; the National Guard, who could not easily be induced to fire upon the populace, from whom the majority of them sprung, and with whom they sympathized, and between 600 and 700 Piedmontese soldiers or conscripts of the Pinerolo brigade, whose depot, by a strange anomaly, was all this time quartered in Parma. These good Piedmontese could, indeed, at all times be relied upon for any honest work, but it is more than doubtful whether with their best will they could have been a match for the whole rabble of the town, backed, as it might in all probability have been, by many of the volunteers and the National Guard."

So here we see the presence of a body of Piedmontese troops in Parma, a "strange anomaly," indeed; and these good Piedmontese, with the whole rabble of the town, and the so-called "guard" sprung from the populace; these formed the strength of the revolution. And immediately afterwards the "Times" called them "riffraff," having already, as observed above, branded them, most truly, as "ruffians." That is to say, we have it now on the testimony of the "Times," that the revolution in Parma was the work of a foreign force, aiding the whole rabble of the town.

Thus, as it was in Parma, so it was in Romagna. So it was in Perugia.

Nor does the case rest here. The "Times" correspondent went on to prove that the revolutionary faction were literally an organized band of assassins:—

"The experience of the murders of Sartorio in 1833, of the Duke in 1856, of Bordi and Magawly in 1856, and others, of which this town was the theatre, proves that neither the full daylight nor the crowded localities in which these deeds were committed could ever bring forward a single witness to testify against their authors, notwithstanding the public notoriety which pointed them out to the authorities. The fact is, that what every man, woman, and child knew by heart could never be made matter of even the least satisfactory evidence before the courts; and that the worst and most notorious offenders must either be released from want of proof, or hanged without proof. The demoralization of the people on that score is complete, and Bruni and his colleagues feel utterly hopeless of success were they to appeal to witnesses in the present case.

Farini's design is, it seems, to sacrifice legality to expediency ; to arrest the perpetrators of Anviti's murder as they happen to be designated by public rumour, (for, from the man who first stabbed the Colonel, to him who beheaded the lifeless corpse, and to him who held the torch before the gory head on its pillory, all are the subject of common talk), and deal with them in some summary manner, thus vindicating the outraged laws by a fresh violation of the laws. To this mode of proceeding Bruni has invincible objections, and now remains to be seen what Farini will do without the aid of competent magistrates. The common belief is that this will amount to nothing but a mere farce—an idle demonstration, barren of results."

And most unquestionably nothing would have been done at all had it not have been for the Emperor. Nothing was done by this virtuous Farini, or Bruni, or any of them, until a week had elapsed, and then we were told,

"The French Consul, M. Paltrineri, has received peremptory orders from Walewski to strike his flag and leave Parma unless the government institute immediate proceedings against Anviti's murderers, and unless they are brought to exemplary punishment."

Thus, then, we have it clearly proved, by the testimony of the "*Times*" itself, that the revolution in Parma was brought about by a band of assassins, by the dregs of the populace, by a demoralized and debased rabble, incited by foreign intrigues, and aided and armed by foreign forces. And we repeat, as it was in Parma so was it in Perugia.

If the "movements" at Bologna and Perugia were purely and really spontaneous, what need was there of the presence of the Piedmontese commissioner and Garibaldi? The Roman correspondent of the *Register* stated that the former was at Bologna, and the *Times* correspondent described the arrival of Garibaldi.

The real mission of this man was, by his brigands, to drive the people into revolt. Borrowing from the Sardinian system he established a "conscription," and those who refused would be branded as "disaffected," in other words, proscribed. The *Times* correspondent himself added these significant words:—"The chiefs of the present order of things pretend that if the Cardinal came to Bologna not one-half of the inhabitants would remain in the city." Mark the word "Pretend."

It is plain that the *Times* correspondent could not help

showing that he disbelieved this. Who can doubt that the Cardinal would be hailed as a protector?

Any pretended plea in favour of the revolt, founded on alleged popular rights, is manifestly dishonest. Do we recognize the right of any portion of the empire—Ireland, for instance—to throw off the dominion of the crown? Moreover, it is to be borne in mind that the Papal government declared, and that there is abundant evidence to prove, that these revolts were not really the free acts of the population of the respective cities, but the result of a reign of terror established by an armed faction, aided by Sardinian support. Thus we read that a chief,

“A certain Cerotti, formerly an officer in the Roman army, who had been exiled in 1849, and who had come to Perugia with 800 Tuscans, had left them, saying that he would soon return. He met at Passignano, a village on the lake, a reinforcement of volunteers, who immediately turned back. Danzetti, a member of the junta, had gone a few days since to Florence to the Sardinian Commissioner, Boncompagni, to ask him to send troops, arms, and a Royal Commissioner, to Perugia; but Boncompagni did not dare do it, and answered, ‘Settle all with Cerotti.’ However M. Boncompagni knew very well the departure of volunteers, and the carriage of arms, &c. The *Giornale di Roma* says, ‘It must be recognised that a considerable number of arms had been sent from Tuscany to Perugia. The same thing has been done at Bologna, where Tuscauy has sent several thousand muskets.’”

And why should this be doubted? The Tuscan revolution had been brought about by Sardinian machination. On the 12th September a Florentine gentleman wrote thus to the *Times*, testifying to that fact.

“Sir,—The impossibility which we unhappy Tuscans feel by any means to make the truth known through the press of our own country, the punishment which too often awaits any private interchange of our real opinion, induce me to appeal to your invaluable assistance in endeavouring to undeceive those statesmen in your country who appear too ready to be led away by false assertions, so often repeated, of tranquillity, which exists but on the surface, and of a pretended national election, which had its origin in intimidation and deception.

“We exist at this moment under oppression without example. We have hardly even the liberty of thought left to us, for on the slightest suspicion we are imprisoned and condemned without any legal sentence. The popular vote so much boasted comprised at the most two per cent. of the population, and if we make the deduction of those votes extorted by compulsion, there will hardly



remain the free expression of opinion of more than one per cent. of the Tuscan people.

"The municipalities are said to have voted spontaneously the annexation to Piedmont. Nothing can be further from the truth. I myself belong to a municipality whose real opinions I well know. All are sincerely desirous of the return of the existing dynasty, and yet their votes are recorded for the fusion. There cannot be a greater proof that the majority of the population really desire the return of our present sovereign, so deservedly popular, than the thousands of persons who, without otherwise compromising themselves, left their cards with Prince Poniatowski, as an indication that they had no sympathy with the existing rulers, by whom he had been so ill received, but ardently desired the return of the existing representative of their late mild and paternal government.

"The public treasury has been plundered, the revenue of the next eighteen months anticipated. In the last four months more than 50,000,000 of Tuscan lire have been squandered, and if this system of extravagant corruption is much longer continued the country will be entirely ruined. The Piedmontese influence was by no means extinguished by the departure of the commissioner. He still continues in all the departments to exercise the same powers through the agents he had placed and through salaried agitators. It is now notorious that it was Piedmontese money scattered on all sides before the 27th of April, which brought about the insurrection. Two superior officers received immense sums for procuring the disaffection of the troops, in order to make evident to the prince that his army had thrown off its allegiance. The great majority of my countrymen, deprived of any external support, oppressed by daily despotism, beset in the public streets by lawless agitators, imprisoned without just cause if they seek justice from the authorities, find themselves almost without the power of devising any means of giving expression to their wish for the return of their lawful sovereign.

"It is therefore hoped that through your columns this sincere contradiction of the untruths daily circulated may be allowed to appear, and that your eminent statesmen may no longer be deceived into giving the moral weight of their support and opinion to the revolution in Tuscany. I trust I have at the same time taken the best means of convincing you, by the most satisfactory reference, that I am a person of respectability, who, living on the spot, would not make any assertions of which I could not prove the truth.

"I am, Sir, your obedient humble servant,
"Florence, Sep. 12.

"A TUSCAN."

That letter was retained by the editor of the *Times* until the 23rd September, during all which time doubtless inquiries were made (as the writer challenged) into the truthfulness of the statements he made, and on that day

it was published, without any contradiction of those statements ; who can doubt that they were as true of Bologna and Perugia ?

The Papal government determined upon doing that which any government in Europe would have deemed it its duty to do, to recover and restore its dominion over the revolted cities. In doing so who can pretend that the Pope was the aggressor, or actuated by motives of ambition ?

All that the Pontiff desired was to do his duty to the Papacy, and hand down the possessions he had received inviolate, so far as his power enabled him to do so. If that were not equally his right and his duty, why is it the duty or the right of any bishop to resist the spoliation of his see, or of any sovereign to resist rebellion ? Yet we know that in every country it is deemed that there is such a right and duty, whether as regards the possessions of a prelate, or the dominions of a prince.

Under such circumstances the cities of Perugia and Bologna had fallen a prey to the revolutionary faction, and the Papal government resolved, if it could, to rescue them. First, its endeavours were directed to the recovery of Perugia. We give the account of what occurred, from the pages of the *Univers*, dated, Rome, June 25th, 1859 :—

“The pontifical troops who left Rome on the 14th, arrived at Foligno on the 19th, in the evening. They had travelled by forced marches under a burning sun, and had left behind them several men killed by the heat. Colonel Schmidt, learning that the rebels, (already numbering 5,000), were about to be augmented by new volunteers from Tuscany, would not stop. He profited by the night, and advanced up to Sta. Maria degli Angeli, ten miles from Perugia. He arrived there at two o'clock in the morning, on the 20th. While the troops rested and made their peace with God in that celebrated sanctuary of St. Francis of Assisi's death, the President Latanzi, commissioned by the Holy Father to supplicate the Perugians to return to their duty, had the grief to see his recommendations and promises of pardon rejected. He granted two hours to the rebels—employed the most persuasive words with the chiefs of the revolt ; but all being useless, the Colonel marched on. The revolted had established at the several gates of the town works of defence, but their efforts had been chiefly directed towards the side of the Roman road. In the inside of the town there was a line of defence, and outside the Roman gate there had been erected a strong barricade, while, about eight hundred yards in advance of this gate, the Benedictine monastery of San Pietro and the esplanade were filled with

sharpshooters. The Pontifical troops did not number more than 2,000 men. Of these, 100 Roman Carabinieri marched in advance of the small army, consisting of Swiss, Roman volunteers who had served in the Crimea, Pontifical Custom-house guards, a few engineers, and a section of Roman artillery. Four hundred men of Roman line infantry formed the rear-guard."

Thus, then, the troops employed were in the main native Roman troops. So the hackneyed topic of prejudice against the Papal government, that it employed foreign forces, had no place on this occasion.

"Below Perugia, on the bank of the river, is a fine stone bridge, and the village of San Giovanni. This village seemed deserted, but a bullet from a window struck down one of the soldiers. The door of the house was thrown down, and a man seized with a weapon in his hand was shot. Scarcely had the van-guard arrived on the esplanade, when it was met by a volley from the rebels. The soldiers had orders not to be the first to attack; the initiative was taken at once by the rebels. The monastery of San Pietro, one of the most admirable monuments of the Renaissance, noted for the works of art which it contains, became at the outset the scene of the struggle. The soldiers took possession of it, killed and wounded a few rebels, and made some prisoners. The town was before them. They left their knapsacks, established an ambulance, where the wounded rebels were placed with their own, and prepared to attack the town. The commanders, Pasquier and Jeannerat, received orders to make diversions, each with five hundred men, on two points of the town; and Colonel Schmidt, reserving to himself the chief attack, had placed opposite the Roman gate an howitzer and a small 9-pounder. A few cannon-balls were fired, and a couple of grenades thrown to intimidate the rebels. But this not having secured submission, the assault of the barricade and the entry of the town were decided upon. The axes of the pioneers, being made for parade, broke after a few blows. Two ladders only had been brought, they were placed and the men mounted quickly under fire. A sergeant pulled off the flag of the rebels and planted the Pontifical banner on the top of the barricade. The first obstacle overcome, the troops entered the main street, which led to the second line of defence. They were received by a sharp firing from the houses, which caused them some losses, and only animated them. In a moment the house doors were broken in and hand to hand fights took place in each house. Two women who were throwing stones from the top of the houses, were shot. The second line was carried as vigorously as the first, and inside the town the Tuscan volunteers, who had the advantage of a sheltered position behind the pierced shutters of the windows, kept up partial fights, which lasted altogether three hours. A Swiss captain, named Aboberg, was killed; the chaplain of the regiment, who received a shot in

his clothes, administered to him the last sacraments in the midst of the fire. Another captain was mortally wounded, and also a lieutenant. The number of the dead, according to the first report was twelve for the troops, with about thirty-five wounded. However, about ninety soldiers are considered *hors de combat*. The insurgents lost from sixty to seventy dead, one hundred wounded, and one hundred and twenty prisoners. Three thousand muskets, brought from Tuscany, with abundant ammunitions, were taken."

Thus, therefore, it was the rebels who had foreign support—the Papal power was upheld by Roman troops. The *Univers* afterwards published the following extracts from the letter of a French religious in Perugia:—

"The Provisional Government lasted a week. It was known on Saturday, that two thousand men had left Rome to take the town by force. On Sunday morning the defence was decided upon, because there were here crowds of men come from Tuscany, who intimidated the population and obliged it to work at the barricades before the gate of San Pietro, and inside the town. The troops were expected on Monday morning. The men armed themselves, and there were along with them prostitutes. Orders were given to the inhabitants to climb up on the roofs of their houses, to throw down the heavy tiles on the soldiers, and no doubt was entertained but that these soldiers would be all massacred. Several bands of revolutionists had gone out to encounter the soldiers. The deputy Lattanzi had vainly sought to dissuade them from their intention. He is a man of great virtue and very eloquent. He had spoken to the Municipality and to the Provisional Government with a warmth and tears which had moved several of them; but they dared not let their repentance be perceived, and they repulsed all conciliation. The Tuscans ran about on all sides like furious men. They planted, by the side of the tri-coloured flag, a black flag, as a sign of war to death. At two o'clock, the troops arrived with a cannon and a howitzer, at the monastery of San Pietro. The rebels received them with a volley, and then began a terrible struggle within the monastery. The revolutionists, compelled to abandon it, took refuge behind the barricades and continued then to fire. The cannon dispersed them. They re-entered the town, and closed the gate; but the soldiers had soon scaled the barricade and driven in the gate.

"Then, with an admirable moderation and courage, an officer advanced, holding in his hand a white flag, to supplicate them once more for peace; but the houses were filled with the revolvers, the roofs covered with people, amongst whom, as I have said, there were women, and the officer was answered with a volley. Then the soldiers filed in, in two lines on both sides of the street, and returned the shots and missiles, which were showered upon them. They broke in the doors to dislodge the revolvers. In our house

these latter had entered since noon. I had taken refuge with our brothers and the children in the cellar. When I thought that the fight was over I came out, but I found soldiers in the yard. I must accuse them of having robbed our hams! and they eat enormous slices thereof. Two shops have been plundered; there have been dilapidations occasioned to some houses; impossible excesses have been mentioned with a falsity as abominable as it is ridiculous; but even supposing them true, who committed them? The Pontifical soldiers, or those rabid Tuscans? For me, I would not hesitate in saying that it is not the former.

Here was the testimony of eye-witnesses, given in a French journal, exposed to the test of the hostile criticism of journals like the *Siecle*, with the best means of information; yet the statements were not refuted.

The first account which appeared in the *Times* of the Perugia affair was in a letter, dated Florence, June 25th. The place was Florence, where the Sardinian commissioner was in authority—the time was five days after the event, and the day after the battle of Solferino—the writer, it will be seen, was an American, and therefore in all probability the person who afterwards (as will be seen) wrote under the signature “Boston,” and who turned out in the end to be Perkins. Well, what does Perkins testify? We are careful to give all that was put forward against the conduct of the Papal government or its troops in the affair, in order that our readers may see how little there is to answer. Observe the dates. The revolt was on the 14th, the re-entry of the troops was six days afterwards, on the 20th, and this letter was written on the 25th. The letter was headed “The Swiss in Perugia,” insinuating what the writer all along conveys, that the troops were merely Swiss, and none of them Roman. Thus the letter began with a studied falsehood, and the same spirit of untruth will be found running through it and pervading every sentence. It will be found, however, that it is self-contradictory, and confutes its own falsehoods; and the elaborate attempt at misrepresentation cannot obscure the few facts on which the whole case turns, that the Papal government had a right to restore its authority by force of arms; that it demanded admission after six days delay, that armed resistance was offered, and that a conflict ensued between armed rebels and the troops, in which, of course, deaths on both sides took place. That is the plain

truth, which it will be found cannot be concealed, despite the most sophistical efforts to misrepresent it.

"Sir,—I think it the duty of an eye-witness to inform you of the atrocities committed by the Papal government at Perugia on the 20th inst., when the Swiss troops, after a forced march, succeeded in entering the town, after a very determined resistance by the inhabitants, who had on the preceding Tuesday (the 14th) risen peaceably, but firmly, *en masse*, against the Legate, and obliged him, and the few Papal troops there, to leave the town.

"There were rumours through the week that the government had sent two regiments from Rome, but the telegraph was silent."

Observe what follows :

"The townspeople enrolled themselves as a National Guard, collected arms and ammunition, and had barricaded the Porta San Pietro, which is at the end of the street in which the Hotel de France, where I and my family were, is situated."

So there was an armed resistance prepared.

"They demanded submission, but the citizens, suffering under the injustice and tyranny which you have so often and ably made public, and with the earnestness which a great hope had given them, replied that their own breasts would be the second barricade the troops would meet.

"A most furious onset was then made, and, of course successfully, against irregular and untrained civilians ; an hour and a half unceasing firing at the gate.

"So far one may, of course, fairly state that any government has an inherent right to keep its subjects in order. However it may have oppressed them, the relation sanctions the attempt at discipline ; but that in this age and in civilized Europe a rebellious town should have been treated as only savages would treat it, surpasses the development one could have expected from the wickedness even of the Roman States."

How is it shown that the Perugians were "treated as savages?" The soldiers were refreshed with a little of the light wine of the country, and then houses in which the rebels were sheltered were assaulted.

"They entered the houses, they fired right and left into the shops and houses, and about two hours after the attack had commenced we heard the doors of the hotel broken in, and shooting in the house, where, I should have said, the master of the inn was unarmed, had remained neutral, and made no resistance. At the door they shot down two of the servants who were calling out it was an inn. These soldiers completely ravaged the house. They killed the master of the house (who was unarmed, endeavouring to expostulate with them) in the most brutal manner, just outside the door of the

room where we were. It was a massacre. One soldier was only prevented from bayonetting the two poor women of the house by a comrade who wrestled with him while they ran to us. Till nine o'clock they were allowed to sack and plunder the town ; and in one case they killed a poor little baby whose mother had pinned a cockade upon it. Seven women were killed, and the most savage revenge was wreaked upon these disobedient children of the Santo Padre. Many of the inhabitants are ruined ; in the Hotel de France not a thing was left whole ; tables, chairs, mirrors, everything pounded and broken into small bits."

This letter appeared in the "Times" on the 2nd of July, and was accompanied by a leader in the usual truculent style. Its sole authority being the letter, to which it refers as such, it is instructive to note how it transcends it, and goes beyond it in mendacity, multiplying and magnifying its falsehoods, in a manner the most utterly unscrupulous. The American lied, but his lies were in some sort the result of a one-sided view, and partly excusable through the excitement and perils of the scene. The "Times" editor, coolly writing a week afterwards, is not content with what he is told, aggravates it and exaggerates it to the utmost ; adds, embellishes, and paints it in the highest possible colours, a great part of his account being pure inventions of his own, entirely so as regards the deliberate slaughter of women and children.

"The sack of Perugia by the troops of the Holy See is an event thoroughly mediæval in its horror and in its complexity, in its crime and in its folly. Never could anything be more utterly needless than any appeal to arms at all in this instance. As the French, while in possession of Rome and victorious in Northern Italy, are the real masters of the Papal States, the rising of the Perugians against either their Legate or his Austrian friends was of itself a blunder. Theirs was a case in which the people, being fortunately out of the range of the war, had only to sit still and wait for the progress of events. Under the impulse of example, however, they turned out the Legate, barricaded the city gates, and waited to see what would come of it. We need scarcely ask what any statesman or any soldier of the only type tolerated or known in these regions would have done in this case. He would have expostulated with the people."

Would he indeed ! How was it at Limerick ? Let our readers just refer backwards to the "Times" account of that massacre :

"He would have pointed out to them that they were rebelling, not so much against the Pope or Austria, as against the nation then

engaged in the liberation of Italy at the invitation of the Italians. It is difficult to conceive that any mob, much less an Italian mob, would be deaf to such an appeal! Had it been successful, it would only have been necessary to show, by some outward sign, by the presence of a few soldiers or an official, the present amicable relations of the Pope and his French protectors, and Perugia would never have heard a shot fired or seen a door forced. As it is, it has suffered all the horrors that soldiers too generally inflict on towns taken by assault after an obstinate defence. Many women, and even a child were deliberately shot dead. (!) Innkeepers and their servants were shot down as they stood at their open doors."

Observe the plural number here. The letter writer only mentioned one. And, again, let us point out that the word *deliberately*, on which the whole of the alleged atrocity turns, is a malignant invention of the editor's.

"Private houses were visited again and again, and their inmates massacred."

This sounds painful, but is an artful and malicious way of putting the obvious truth, that the soldiers had again and again to dislodge murderous wretches, who, ensconced in the houses, were firing upon them.

"All this was done by the Swiss troops, avenging the expulsion of their comrades, and acting, possibly, as many other soldiers would have done after a forced march, mad with fatigue, hunger, drink, and a couple of hours' fighting."

No doubt, "possibly as many other soldiers would have done." As any other soldiers. That is, they slew those who were trying to slay them.

Nothing more can be made of it, except by pure wicked fabrication. So far as the armed men are concerned, no case can be made at all against the Papal government. So they are not mentioned at all. They are kept out of sight. The letter writer just mentioned them and then dropped them. The "Times" editor never mentions them at all. You would suppose the onslaught was on a peaceful unarmed assemblage, with women and children, whereas it was one of the most arduous and perilous services in which troops can be engaged—a street fight—with armed men concealed in houses on each side, firing out of the windows, and refusing to be dislodged except in detail, by successive assaults upon the separate houses. This was precisely the species of military science which the Duke of Wellington described as the most dangerous in which

troops can be engaged, and to which he declined exposing the masses of troops he had concentrated on the occasion of the Chartist demonstration, concealing them in barracks, prepared to occupy the houses and to fire upon the mob, had they dared to resist the police, as the Perugians resisted the Papal forces. All this is kept studiously out of sight, and the reader's attention is concentrated upon a few alleged deaths of women and children, occurring, (if they occurred at all), through stray shots; just as at Limerick, or on any other similar occasion. Such is the way in which the people of this country are informed of public events! Such is the way in which they are systematically misled, by those who profess to be bent upon their enlightenment! Such is the way in which, as Mr. Buckle tells us, the "press helps to conceal the truth and diffuse falsehood." Let us recur to the lying leader of the leading journal. We would not for the world miss a word of it. It is too instructive. It is well that Catholics, at all events, and such Protestants as do us the honour to be among our readers, should know how deliberately and wickedly their great journal lies. We have here an ample opportunity of doing so. There is the letter of his correspondent, and there is his own mendacious article pretending to be founded upon it. It runs thus:—

"Had there been anything at all casual about the affair, had it been the case of some Croat regiment which had lost its way in the retreat, and stumbled on some Italian town which refused them admission, fatigued and famished as they were, it would have been passed over as a too ordinary feature of war. But there is something in this affair which shows the act, not quite of a statesman or a soldier, but of one who would be both, if he could, but who has the craft without the virtue of a profession not his own. We have said what a soldier would have done. Perhaps here we see what an ecclesiastic, with a touch of the brigand, has accomplished. No sooner was the foolish rising of the Perugians known at Rome than the telegraph was stopped, and when the simpletons went so ask what measures His Holiness was taking to win them back to his gentle sway, they found all mute. The Swiss regiments despatched against them took by-roads, and never rejoined the main road till they had reached the very suburbs of Perugia. Drink, not food, was the cry, and, having pillaged the wine-shops, they rushed into the city. It had no time now for repentance. After an hour and a-half's fighting, the newly-levied and untrained National Guard was easily overcome, and Perugia became the spoil of the Swiss mercenaries. How they dealt with it is described elsewhere by an eye-

witness and sufferer, and is just what was to be anticipated under the circumstances. But can any one doubt that it was anticipated? Whoever planned the secret march and the sudden surprise knew what he was about. He wished to use the weapon while it remained in his hand, and to show the thunders of the Vatican even in this its hour of perplexity. He knew how to sidle up to his victim, and strike the sudden blow."

The moment the editor departs from his mendacity, he merges into sheer stupidity; what does all this amount to, but the truism, that the Papal government prepared its measures beforehand;—garnished by the falsehood, that the Perugians did not expect them? The letter writer plainly tells us in one place that they did.

Perhaps we ought to apologize for transcribing this ribaldry, but we do so however not merely upon the principle on which the Spartans showed their children the drunken Helots, but to convince our readers that we have not shrunk from encountering any and every thing that has been said against the Holy See on this matter.

"But, while Europe sits by to see Austria expelled from her old Italian possessions, what will she say to the mode in which this other power first drives her subjects to rebellion, and then, without parley or time for repentance, without those hours of grace that civilized powers always give to the delinquent, surrenders her own people to massacre and pillage? The French are coming forward as the friends of Italy, as the champions of freedom,—a crusade which results alone can justify. Do they stimulate and assist insurrection in Lombardy and Venice, and Tuscany and Parma, only to put it down with the red hand in the Papal States? Perugia has only followed the example of Florence and a dozen other cities. It expelled the Viceroy of an absolute sovereign and his foreign mercenaries. What difference can France see between the two cases, that she should take one by the hand and strike the other to the ground? And France must be held partly responsible for this deed. The executioners went from Rome, from out of the French garrison, and it is impossible that the commander was ignorant of their errand and its infallible results. Unless France would incur still more dreadful responsibilities, she would do well to desist from backing up the Holy See in its temporal dominion. If the massacre of Perugia is the last and finest fruit of a perfect Christian polity, then is it time that the Pope should abandon an experiment evidently beyond his powers, and leave his States to govern themselves, if they please, under the rules of Holy Church, but not as his temporal property and patrimonial estate."

"The massacre of Perugia, the last and finest fruit of a

perfect Christian polity." Why, no. Not at all. It was the last and fatal fruit of an accursed and unchristian polity; the polity of liberalism, which teaches people to rebel against their lawful rulers, and become conspirators and murderers.

"This is only one more example to show how unfit preachers and ministers are to wield the instruments of slaughter."

They did not wield the "instruments of slaughter." They tried to liberate those who were under a reign of terror, and the men they employed acted in self-defence.

"No restoration of Italy will be complete that does not secularize the Papal States, and make the Pope and Sacred College pensioners on the Catholic Powers, with Rome and its immediate neighbourhood, if necessary, under their own police. Nothing is more feasible, certainly nothing more consistent with the principles of the Papacy, which is the spiritual head, not of a few Italian cities, but of all the people who hold the occupant of 'St. Peter's chair' to be 'the Vicar of Christ.'"

The stupidity of this is as flagrant as the mendacity of the preceding portion. "The Pope a pensioner on the Catholic powers!"

Which of them? All of them? Who is to enforce the contributions? Spain and Sardinia, which secularized the estates of the Church in their own dominions, are very likely to contribute regularly for the support of the Supreme Pontiff, with whom they have been engaged in ominous controversies! Suppose they, or any other state, whose rulers the Pope has reason to excommunicate, should "stop the supplies," to use a phrase so current in this country. The Pope, a pensioner on the Catholic powers. The grand object of kingly anti papal policy, in every age. The object of Philip the Fair and Louis XIV., of the first Napoleon and of the third. Witness the imperial pamphlet, on the secularization of the states of the Church. The French Emperor would wish it, for it would promote despotism. The English Protestants because it would enslave the Papacy.

We have given the assailants of the papacy credit for the truth of the statements in the letter, as to the facts that some women and a child were killed; but the account given by the "*Giornale di Roma*," shows that of the several cases of persons killed, therein mentioned, some have been killed under very different circumstances from

those asserted, some are only wounded, some safe and sound, and others are imaginary persons. Among the latter is the baby reported to have been killed. That account is evidently correct, for it gives the very names of the parties, and we particularly beg attention to the true facts, as to the killing of the innkeeper and his servants:—

“The soldiers entered furiously the inn of Giuseppe Storti, whence shots had been fired which had killed a soldier and wounded Lieutenant Crufer. Stones and all kinds of furniture had been thrown from the windows. There some individuals, arms in hand, threw themselves on the soldiers, and in the struggle the innkeeper Storti, his waiter Luigi Genovesi, and a postillion, Luigi Bindocci, were killed. Then it was probably that the inn of Storti, where was lodged an American family, which was safe guarded by the intervention of some of these soldiers, was injured. Several articles taken have been returned to that family.”

How completely the revolt was the act of a faction, appears from the facts that the parties chiefly complicated were known and mentioned. Thus, for example, we read,—

“Madame Valentini, sister of Prince Canino, has been the principal *boute en train* of sedition which opened the gates of Perugia to the forces of the Tuscan revolution. Madame Wise, another sister of Canino, endeavoured to perform the same part at Viterbo.”

And, on the other hand, we find that on the 9th of July, as stated by the Roman correspondent of the “Univers,”

“A deputation from Perugia was received by the Holy Father. It was commissioned by its fellow citizens to protest against the abominable calumnies of the revolutionary press, and to lay at the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff the homage of the fidelity, devotion, and gratitude of the town of Perugia.”

The revolt was as much the act of Perugia as the riots of 1832 were the act of the city of Bristol.

On the 12th July the Papal Government issued a manifesto, in the form of a circular, to its representatives at foreign courts; and in this manifesto clearly conveyed its own view of the events which had occurred, and plainly declares the complicity of Sardinia.

“Amidst all the apprehensions and anxieties occasioned by the present deplorable war, the Holy See had reason to think that it would be unmolested, after the many assurances it had received—assurances with which even the King of Piedmont had associated himself; for on the advice of the Emperor of the French, his ally,

he refused the dictatorship which was offered him in the revolted provinces of the Pontifical States. But it is painful to state things have turned out very differently, and facts occur every day under the eyes of the Holy See and its government which show more and more how inexcusable is the conduct of the Sardinian Cabinet towards the Holy See—conduct which clearly proves that it is intended to strip the Holy See of a part of its temporal dominions.

“Since the revolt of Bologna, which His Holiness in his Allocution of June 30 has already taken occasion to deplore, that city has become the rendezvous of a multitude of Piedmontese officers, coming from Tuscany and Modena for the purpose of preparing quarters for the Piedmontese troops. From these foreign states thousands of muskets have been brought, wherewith to arm insurgents and volunteers; cannons, also, have been imported to aggravate the troubles in revolted provinces, and to encourage the audacity of the disturbers of order.

“Another fact, which renders the refusal of the dictatorship completely illusory, and adds to a flagrant violation of neutrality an active co-operation in the maintenance of the Church, is the nomination of the Marquis d’Azeglio as an extraordinary commissioner in Romagna to direct the movement of the legation during the war; this step, under the specious pretext of preventing the national movement from leading to any disorder, is a violation of the legitimate sovereignty of the Pope; two officers of control, one of whom is a Piedmontese, have been sent to Romagna to mine and destroy that fortress.

“Such odious proceedings, in the perpetration of which a flagrant violation of the law of nations is manifest, in more than one point of view, cannot but fill the soul of the Holy Father with bitterness, and provoke in him a lively and just indignation, which is rendered more poignant still by the surprise with which he sees such enormities proceed from the government of a Catholic king who had accepted the advice of his august ally to refuse the dictatorship offered to him.

“All the measures taken with the view of preventing or attenuating this series of evils having been in vain, the Holy Father, not forgetful of the duties incumbent upon him for the protection of his states and for the preservation in its integrity of the temporal domain of the Holy See, which is essentially connected with the free and independent exercise of the Supreme Pontificate, protested against the violations and usurpations committed in breach of the acceptance of neutrality, and desires that his protest may be communicated to all the European Powers; he feels assured that they will support him; they will not permit the success of a manifest violation of the law of nations and the rights of the Holy Father. He trusts that they will not hesitate to co-operate in vindication of

those rights, and to that end he invokes their assistance and protection."

The whole matter was admirably stated in a letter written from Rome (July 8th,) which (signed 'Romanus') appeared in the Tablet, although addressed to the Times; in a spirit of sarcasm its utter unfairness and insensibility to justice, are happily expressed in the opening sentence.

"Sir.—It was well observed by Cardinal Wiseman, at the time of the Titles' Bill ferment, that a calm and sober appeal to the good sense of the English people is seldom made in vain; and I think it would very much serve the cause of any such appeal if it could have the good fortune to be made through the medium of your columns. But the advocacy of anything Catholic is believed to stand but little chance of admittance into your (for us unfortunately) most influential paper: and I should altogether despair of the appearance there of this letter did I not believe that a question affecting Catholic interests may be so grossly misrepresented as to call into action that keen sense of fair-play and honesty which is happily an essential attribute in the character of every English gentleman, no matter what may be his politics or his religion."

We need hardly say that nothing of the kind appeared in the Times. The writer proceeded thus:

"Verily, the Papal Government has a difficult game to play. Its habitual meekness and necessarily paternal character constantly expose it to charges of imbecility and irresolution; while, on the other hand, the most indispensable measures of repression awaken loud and angry cries of 'Despotism, Tyranny, and Cruelty.' The late occurrences at Perugia have afforded an opportunity and an excuse to wild and unscrupulous revolutionists of indulging largely in this latter censure; and it is to be regretted that French and English journals have unhesitatingly adopted these *ex-parte* statements, and widely propagated the slander.

"If the enemies of the Papacy were to confine themselves to the use of those arguments only, that are consistent with logic and with facts, it would be natural to suppose that Protestant Editors would eagerly and zealously copy and circulate them; but the illogical bombast, the exaggerations and falsehoods of Italian revolutionary scribblers should not find an echo in the English Press—particularly that portion of it which approves of the treatment of the 'sister country' by our own Government.

"It is evidently illogical to admit that the Pope is a legitimate Sovereign; and, at the same time, to pretend that unprovoked rebellion against his authority is not a crime. And again, to extol the sacredness of his spiritual character is an insufficient proof

that he has not a right to suppress unwarrantable attempts against his temporal power. 'The Pope,' they exclaim, 'is a Priest—a Bishop—a man of God; He should rule only *by love* (*sic.*); and the pre-eminent sanctity of his position is profaned by the use of powder, bayonets, and Swiss Guards.' The character of the men who use this language makes us strongly suspect its sincerity; for if they really respected the sacredness of the Pope's person, they would not flock from all parts of Italy, and from more remote quarters, to disseminate Red-Republican doctrines, to blow the coals of revolution, to form secret societies, to entrap the giddy and incautious, and to demoralise or pain the well-disposed subjects of His Holiness."

Observe how the episode of the American Perkins is mentioned and disposed of.

"The attention of the military was also drawn to the hotel of one Joseph Storti, by the tiles, stones, and gunshots that proceeded from the windows. It most unaccountably happened—there is no accounting for tastes—that an American family continued to reside here, notwithstanding the positive indications that there would be bloody work in a few days. The hotel attacked the troops, and the troops attacked the hotel; and in the row the Americans found themselves minus six trunks and seven carpet-bags. The troops were blamed, *of course*, because nothing can be more natural than to suppose that, having very little to do, and nothing at all to think about, they should throw away their arms and knapsacks, to load themselves with baggage. The fact of a foreign family having been molested has given much concern to the authorities; but it is likely that they themselves do not consider their case so very deplorable. Their having remained six days longer than was necessary in the midst of turbulence, shows that they had no objection to an adventure—few Americans have—and when they return home they will be congratulated on having displayed an amount of fearlessness 'calculated to astonish all creation.' Besides, they have been indemnified for their losses; and, perhaps, the only thing desirable to them is their having been pitied.

"It would be tedious to enumerate the many charges brought against these 'Swiss Mercenaries,' and the various facts urged in explanation of their conduct; but whoever is curious on the subject may find a very satisfactory relation of the whole affair in the *Roman Journal* of the 2nd instant. The editor charges the revolutionary press with exaggeration and falsehood, and protests against implicit belief being given to reports drawn up by the very men who fled from Perugia after the fight, and took refuge in Tuscany. Certainly one cannot read the article in question without remembering the common saying, that 'one story is good until the other has been told.'

"But the revolutionary party seem more anxious to discredit the

government than to inveigh against the troops. For this purpose they have gone so far as to forge government documents sanctioning acts of violence and barbarity. They have procured blank sheets of paper, sent by post from Perugia, on which they have written whatever best suited the purposes of defamation, and appealed to the post-mark as a proof that these accounts came from the seat of action. One of these reports is evidently written by a person better versed in the arts of calumny than in the science of geography, for he represents a child torn from his mother's arms and cast—into the Tiber.

“The Papal government deplores, more than any one else, the sad occurrences at Perugia, but that it is not responsible for them can be plainly inferred, not only from the character of Lattanzi's mission, but from the instructions given to Colonel Schmidt. The worthy man was not only commanded most imperatively, but most feelingly implored, to restrain his men from any unnecessary acts of violence. He was pathetically reminded that the rebels, although wicked and unscrupulous, were still the children of the Church; and that respect should be had for the feelings of the Holy Father, whose heart was bursting with anguish at the necessity of force being employed at all. Colonel Schmidt has been promoted to the rank of General, an act which the Papal government would not dare to do, in the face of the French occupation, if the accusations of the revolutionists were not entirely devoid of truth. Nevertheless, that its acts may be justified before all men, the government have sent a commission to Perugia to make ‘ulterior investigation;’ in order that opportune remedies may be applied, if the laws have in any case been outraged, or military discipline violated. Surely we should not altogether disregard authentic official reports, and give implicit faith to those who are liberals in name only—who are enemies of religion because she supports the cause of order; and in whose ranks are to be found the hypocrite and the infidel—the polished conspirator and the rude brigand—the political slanderer and the midnight assassin.”

The following letter, received from Rome, dated the 5th inst., appeared in the *Times*.

“The revolution triumphs throughout the Romagna. . . . A despatch of M. de Cavour, dated the 26th of June, has communicated to us the reply of the King of Sardinia to the deputation which the Bolognese sent to the camp. King Victor Emmanuel . . . has consented to take the direction of the troops which the insurgents of the Romagna are forming for the war of independence. The Pontifical government has not a sufficient military force to recover possession of the Legations. . . The Pope is, consequently, reduced to the necessity of protesting against the conduct of the Sardinian government, which is fomenting the revolution in

the Pontifical States, of which the neutrality was recognized both by France and Austria."

Observe this admission. It came from the columns of the Times.

"All the rest of the Pontifical dominions are perfectly quiet. Some towns, such as Perugia, Urbino, Sinigaglia, Fano, and Citta di Castello, had followed the example of Bologna. But they have already made their submission; others have been compelled to submit by the Pontifical troops. Some foreign emissaries endeavoured to raise the population of Fabriano, but they only succeeded in hoisting the national colours at the Town-house. The energy of the Marquis Morici, the delegate of the province, preserved tranquillity at Forma. At the first movement he imprisoned the principal agitators, and the others fled."

Such was the result of a layman's regime. What can more clearly show that it is only part of the population who are infected, and that these troubles are the work of a few bad men?

"Among those imprisoned is the Marquis de Trevisani, a relative of the Prince of Canino. To speak frankly, if the Cardinals Legate of Forli, Perugia, and Ancona, had exhibited more energy—if they had merely performed their duty—the provinces under their direction would not have risen in insurrection, and we should not have to lament the sad events of Perugia. All these facts will, we trust, open the eyes of the Pope, and induce him not again to place at the head of provinces prelates without either talent or experience. We are expecting 1,000 men from France to increase the French army of occupation at Rome to 10,000 men."

That is to say, because the ecclesiastics were not so prompt and so stern as lay governors would be, the "liberals" actually make this matter of reproach, and profit by their mildness, and then revile them for "weakness." Yet when, as at Perugia, they acted firmly, they were reviled for cruelty. But it is evident that the writer of the above knew nothing of the desertion of Bologna by the Austrians.

"But the revolutionary press complain of the tyranny, cruelty, and military excess committed at Perugia. 'Mark how a plain tale will put them down.'

"The city of Perugia is built upon a considerable eminence on the borders of Tuscany. Its facilities of defence and the proximity to the already revolutionised Archdukedom, and not any grievance or complaint on the part of the citizens, was the reason why it was pitched upon as a suitable place for a revolutionary movement.

The ringleaders were men who had acquired an abominable notoriety in the Revolutions of '31 and '49. The Pope could not send them to Bermuda or Norfolk Island; but he had other means of giving them their deserts. He pardoned them, however; and they showed their gratitude by pulling down the Papal arms, and raising the standard of revolt, by proclaiming a provisional government, and setting the authorities at defiance. Such acts of barefaced rebellion could not be overlooked by any government; and the only thing singular on the part of that of the Pope, is the really astonishing meekness and charity that was manifested, in a most sincere desire to 'rule only by love.' Unwilling to adopt measures of vigour, and shrinking from the likelihood of bloodshed, the government despatched a distinguished Privy Councillor, Aloysius Lattanzi, to treat with the rebels in a spirit of conciliation. The very selection of this gentleman shows the spirit of the government. He was chosen because, 'being a native of Perugia, and having been for many years Chief Justice of that city, he had acquired much authority with the inhabitants, and was beloved and esteemed by all classes for the rectitude of his judicial conduct and the amiability of his manners.' He presented himself before the *soi-disant* provisional government, and left no argument unused in order to induce them to desist from their wild attempt. He urged the impossibility of success. The citizens were loyal, and a few Tuscan desperadoes, aided by a mob of wretches that had been seduced by promises, by money, and by hopes of plunder, could not effectually resist well appointed troops. He pathetically described the calamities which would follow resistance, the victims that would be sacrificed, and the damage that the city would sustain. But the suasive eloquence of Lattanzi was thrown away upon men whose trade is revolution, and who are 'sold to do evil.' Messrs. Guardabassi, Faina, and Berrardi, declared that the entire city was with them;* that they were well prepared to resist, and had engaged, even old men, women, and children, to throw from the house-tops whatever missiles would be calculated to crush the troops."

The writer proceeds to subject the complaints of the revolutionists and their friends to the practical test of a comparison between their treatment by the Pope, and our own way of dealing with such characters at home.

"One is here forcibly reminded of the advice given by John Mitchell to the citizens of Dublin. That zealous advocate of the

* The falsehoods of this assertion is plain from the result. If the city had joined the rebels, one regiment, with a few artillerymen, would not have taken the town in three hours, or in three weeks.

'holy cause,' reminded his readers that every bar in the street-palings might be used as a pike; that they should throw their furniture from the windows upon the Saxon mercenaries,* and the coping-stones from the parapets; and that the roofs would supply abundant material for molten lead to be similarly used. It is no great wonder that there should be some identity of sentiment between Mr. Mitchell and the Perugian Triumvirate; but it really is astonishing that those who shrink with horror at the 'atrocities' of the former, should applaud the conduct of the latter, merely because it is directed against the Pope; although (certain applications of the Apocalypse notwithstanding) His Holiness is allowed, even by Liberals, to be the most amiable of men, and the mildest of princes.

"Englishmen are so prone to make comparisons between their own government and those of Italy, that I expect to be forgiven the following:—

"Suppose that our own political 'Martyrs' were again to contemplate a Ballingarry revolution—that they were to assemble in 'the city of the violated treaty,' tear down the lion and the unicorn from the town-hall and the court-house, drag the union-jack through the gutter, and set up in its stead the 'green flag of Erin'—suppose they were to fortify themselves in the English town, and, having supplied the Abbey boys and the Garry Owen girls with whiskey and money, were to read to them the instructions of John Mitchell—and suppose this state of things to have lasted six days; is it at all likely that Lord Clarendon would say—'If we don't treat these rebels with mildness, blood will certainly be spilt; and *that*, at all events, is to be avoided. Let us send down the Right Hon. William Monsell. He is one of her Majesty's Privy Council, he has resided many years in Limerick; and by his public conduct and private virtues, he has gained the good will and esteem of his fellow-citizens. He may bring them back to a sense of their duty?' If Lord Clarendon were so to speak, he certainly would be accused; but the items against him would not be tyranny, cruelty, and oppression. Yet these are the charges brought against the Papal government by the Revolutionists. But English journalists should be aware that the *Tuscan Monitor*, the *Commercial Courier*, and the *Bologna Monitor*, are actuated by the same feelings towards the Roman Government, that were manifested towards the British Cabinet eleven years ago by the *Nation*, the *Felon*, and the *United Irishman*. Ah, Mr. Editor, how very differently we look upon the same facts when they regard ourselves, and when they concern those for whom we have no sympathy."

This is plainly and powerfully put, and we beg especial

* "The Swiss Mercenaries" is the term used by the *Daily News*, as copied by *Galignani*.

attention to the particularity with which the facts are stated, evidently from the testimony of eye witnesses. The account in this respect bears on its face its own intrinsic evidence of truthfulness.

“Colonel Schmidt had drawn up his troops at Saint John’s-bridge to await the result of Lattanzi’s negotiations ; and the latter had barely time to communicate his failure, when they were fired on by the rebels. This will doubtless be considered sufficient provocation by those at least of your readers who approve of the conduct of our own troops at Six-mile-bridge. The gallant colonel marched forward, and the details of the combat are given in his published official report. Every conflict between troops and rebels must be followed by deplorable consequences ; but the terrible responsibility will ever remain with those who drive the constituted authorities to the painful necessity of maintaining their legitimate rights, and upholding the cause of order, by armed force. Revolutionists of all times and in all countries have endeavoured to transfer this responsibility to the government, but in vain. Soldiers are men whose business it is to redress violence by force ; and proportionate to the resistance they meet with, must be the terrible measures of repression. Four or five women, it seems, have been shot at Perugia ; but, much as we must regret it, we cannot expect that Swiss Guards will so far exceed other men in gallantry as to refrain from firing at windows, from which stones and furniture are being hurled at their heads. The lovely amazons who undertake to fling a pianaforte from a balcony, should calculate their chances of a bullet before entering on the dangerous enterprise.

“All through S. Peter’s Ward, from the Monastery of S. Peter to the Church of S. Herculanus, the resistance of the rebels was most desperate. They fought more like demons than like men. The reign of terror was perfectly established in this ward. The inhabitants of Peter-street had received menacing orders early in the morning, to leave their doors and windows open, in order that the rebels might have free access to the apartments ; which were well supplied with boiling water, stones, and firearms. In Italy the houses are covered with tiles instead of slates, and from the roofs of the Orphanage and other buildings, these destructive weapons fell thick as hail upon the military. There operations were directed by a fellow of the not inappropriate name of Bruschi, who had assumed the title of Town Major ; and whose conduct, even when resistance was no longer available, provoked the troops to acts that, under the circumstances, were as inevitable as they are deplorable. That the damage done to property was more the result of necessity than of vengeance, is plain from the fact that St. Peter’s Monastery—a place which the troops of the Pope would be inclined to respect, suffered the most. Here, after the Swiss had obtained complete possession, a soldier was shot in cold blood, while in the act of

drinking, by a ruffian who had concealed himself in some lurking-place. Much rout has been made about the damage done to the house of the druggist, Bellucci, who is falsely said to have been killed. The fact is, that a young drummer was standing opposite his door, gazing in boyish amazement at the effects of the late contest, when he was most wantonly shot. When his comrades saw him fall, and the blood quickly leave his youthful features, they rushed madly into the druggist's, and did some damage in looking for the master of the house ; but they immediately retired on being assured that the shot proceeded from one of the opposite windows."

The Roman correspondent of the *Register*, writing on the 2nd of July, the very day on which the *Times* had its leader on the subject, said,—

"The excitement which prevailed in Rome about a week ago, has died away. And the *extalati*, the expressive name by which the revolutionists are here known, finding that they cannot succeed in their attempts to dethrone the Pope, are endeavouring to console themselves, by circulating the most horrible accounts of the cruelty of the Pope's troops. A month ago they were complacently rubbing their hands, under the idea that the Pontifical troops would all prove unfaithful; now they are lifting up their eyes in pious horror at the cruelty with which these same troops have put down the revolution, wherever they were in sufficient number to do so. If we may believe these humane and civilised Italians, not one of whom would scruple at employing the dagger of the assassin, the Croats and Turcos are not to be compared in cruelty with the troops of His Holiness Pope Pius IX. A short time ago they were crying out that the Pope was too weak to be able to rule, now they think it of all things the most cruel and unnatural that a sovereign who is a priest, should order his troops to fire upon his own people. So it is, and so it ever will be, I suppose, with these wretched men. Whatever the Pope does, is simply wrong in their eyes, and can never in any way be justified. I am glad to say, that the government is about to publish an official account of the taking of Perugia, which it is to be hoped, will soon give the lie to many of these reports. It must, however, be borne in mind that great provocation was given to the soldiers, at Perugia, for I hear that in one part of the town boiling water was poured upon their heads."

The attempt made was to throw on the Papal government the odium of alleged excesses on the part of its forces. This, of course, quite conceded its right to restore its authority over the revolted city. And as to the alleged excesses, none were substantiated, or even distinctly stated, certainly, not on anything like impartial testimony. The truth is, that all this outcry about excesses came to nothing at all, when coolly looked at. Assuming the

right to reduce the city by force, the armed resistance justified the shooting of all persons found, not only in the act of fighting, but persons with arms in their hands, just come from conflict with the troops; and as a conclusive answer to all the complaints about "shooting persons after the fight," we point to the small number slain altogether, and the fact, that no one is alleged to have been slain after the very evening of the actual conflict. Of course, the *Telegraph*, the organ of the Italian liberals in this country, made the most of the occasion; and unabashed by the undenied accounts of the horrors perpetrated by our civil and military authorities in India, accounts so horrible that (as it will be remembered) the minister for India could only beg the House of Commons to dismiss the subject in solemn silence—it thus began its diatribe:—

"After the admonition furnished by the correction (?) of some of the most appalling statements in connection with the Indian revolt, English journalists would be without excuse if they believed on less than authenticated evidence accounts of such inhuman atrocities as are ascribed to the soldiers of a pre-eminently Christian sovereign. We deeply regret that such reserve can no longer be maintained. Ample time has been allowed for the government of the Roman States to contradict, if they were capable of contradiction, the statements which have been circulated on the authority of unhappy eyewitnesses;"—

There being no such statements (not anonymous) except that of the insurgents themselves, and the complaint of Mr. Perkins.

"In the place of such denial, we have the report of Colonel Schmidt, the commander of the foreign legion employed in the affair, and who has been raised to the dignity of General, as a mark of Pontifical approbation. Comparing this evasive and inconsistent document with the minute and varied accounts emanating from the sufferers, it is impossible not to feel that Perugia has been the scene of a tragedy black as any on which the waves of 'yellow Tiber' have reflected since the days of pagan oppression or of mediæval perfidy."

The "sufferers," mark, however, are the assassins who were vanquished.

"Has the Pope, it is demanded by the French apologist of all things Papal, has the Pope, in re-establishing his authority in a revolted city, exceeded the rights of every sovereign?"

That, no doubt, is the sole question. But how is it dealt with?

"Some of those to whom the question is addressed will not have forgotten that when the subjects of His Holiness claimed his benediction on the banner of an army going forth to fight under Charles Albert, he declared that the Austrians, being Catholic, were equally his children with the Romans, and that brothers might not make war on brothers. How this doctrine can be made to harmonize with the rights of a sovereign prince, the *Univers* will never be able to explain."

As if there was any analogy between an offensive war on a friendly Christian power, in the face of treaties guaranteed by Europe, and a defensive and protective attempt to restore law and order in a revolted city!

"That a hybrid personage, half priest and half ruler, can in the one capacity refuse to make war upon foreigners, in the other bombard and bayonet his own subjects into submission, is an anomaly too monstrous for acceptance by the general sense of mankind, and not a little painful to sincerely religious believers in the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. The Roman question is, after all, the cause of the Italian difficulties. Austrian occupation of Lombardy and Venice is slight in comparison. The map of the world presents too many instances of an unnatural appropriation of its soil, the appropriation of Greece by Turks, of India by England, to make the presence of German armies in Italy anything more than an accident of conquest or a fruit of diplomatic crime. But the secular sovereignty of the Pope is something unique as well as unnatural. It is such a monstrosity as fifteen centuries have failed to reproduce. In every other example of the union of civil and ecclesiastical functions, the ecclesiastical is subordinate to the civil. In Rome only is the sacerdotal character so blended with the sovereign."

Just so. That is all it amounts to, that the Government is sacerdotal. It is assumed that it must therefore be bad. Because your liberal hates the priesthood. Let us see what else it could say. We shall find much antithesis, no strength of effective argument.

"The representative of the Redeemer—the executioner of human justice, the vice-gerent of the Prince of Peace, the master of a mercenary soldiery. The antithesis is so monstrous as scarcely to have needed elaboration by the caustic pen of Edouard About. But surely it is a sign of coming judgment from heaven upon a system as impious as impolitic, that just as all men are reading and thinking about the impossibility of maintaining the Papal throne beyond the period of Austrian rule in Northern Italy, the massacre of Perugia lights up a blood-red flame, to set off that throne in horrid relief against the black storm cloud of a people's discontent. If it be necessary for the Pope to maintain an army of foreign hire-

lings, the ruffian refuse of countries whose governments disclaim them as outlawed subjects; cut-throats who, with equal readiness, would stop a traveller and sack a city; if it be necessary to employ these brigands in uniform against the people of a quiet little town like Perugia—a city of 20,000 inhabitants and fifty monastic establishments—and to suppress their disaffection by the edge of the sword, it is impossible that either the spiritual or secular functions can be well discharged.”

Aye, but it was not necessary to employ a force against the “people:” nor to suppress their disaffection. But to expel a band of brigands, many of them foreign brigands, brought in to terrorize the “people.” It was for the protection of the people that the papal forces came.

“Sovereigns who govern wisely do not need foreign guards. Priests who live in the hearts of their flocks do not asperse them with a fiery shower of bullets and cannon shot. All Catholic Christendom must demand that its head be relieved of the secular crown; and that, assured of a secure and dignified residence in the Eternal City, he be free to administer the affairs of his vast spiritual empire.”

“Sovereigns who govern wisely do not need foreign guards.” Indeed! Why then so many English troops in Ireland? so many Irish and English troops in India or Ionia? And how differ foreign bayonets or bullets from native?

“But if the Pope were an ordinary sovereign, if, instead of being elected from a conclave of pastors, he were a born Hapsburg or Romanoff, we should say he had very much exceeded his legitimate rights in sanctioning the brutalities perpetrated at Perugia. It is undoubtedly the duty of a ruler to repress rebellion with the utmost promptitude consistent with the discrimination of the innocent from the guilty. His right to employ severity is circumscribed by the duty of being just, and the moment that authority is re-established, clemency becomes an obligation. How are we to reconcile with these principles the slaughter of women and children,—the shooting or bayoneting of men standing unarmed in their door-ways,—the outrages attempted upon the American family who owed their deliverance to a soldier less brutal than his comrades,—the rifling of shops and houses,—the shooting down of helpless fugitives as they attempted to steal out of the town? The particular facts that make up this tableau of suffering and atrocity are deposed to by witnesses who enumerate by name the unfortunate victims—of none of whom does General Schmidt make any mention. He speaks of his troops having taken by assault the houses from which they had been fired at, but is silent as to their

ransacking bedchambers and closets to discover the unhappy objects of their lust and cruelty."

For the very sufficient reason that no one ever stated a single instance of such atrocities, as against the Papal forces.

"He reports the awful number of ten killed and thirty-five wounded in a contest which he describes as having occupied three or four hours, and as having been carried on under a heavy fire from barricades in the first instance, and subsequently from a fort. He computes 'the enemy' at 5,000, which would be considerably more than all the adult males of the place."

Well: and what then? Why what the papal government complained of was the presence of foreign brigands. And, alas! as we have seen, a great number of the brigands were youths.

Now here the Pope's right is admitted, and recourse is had to the usual reckless system of calumny.

Straightway appeared in the *Times* a long letter from one Perkins, (an American,) which we give entire, that the reader may see how little there is in it. It was headed "The Sack of Perugia."

"Sir,—As you have already opened your columns to a communication from one of my family, who wrote a hurried account of our adventures, and the imminent hazards to which we were exposed during the sack and pillage which followed the assault on ill-starred Perugia by the 1st Foreign Regiment in the Pope's service, you may, perhaps, be willing to publish a few more details, which the press of correspondence, growing out of this outrage, with Mr. Stockton, the American Minister at Rome, has henceforth prevented me from giving.

"The despatch of the mercenaries under the command of Colonel Schmidt, (now raised to the rank of General for the faithful and more than literal execution of his orders,) was an act of vigour of which no one would have supposed the Papal government capable."

Just so. When the Papal government is mild it is called weak, when it acts with rigour men raise an outcry about cruelty.

"The troops left Rome on Tuesday the 14th, the day of the popular demonstration, which drove the Perugian authorities, with the few soldiers under them, to take refuge in Foligno. On the evening of that day we arrived in Perugia, and saw the illumination and torchlight procession, which was doubly impressive in the picturesque Corso, crowded with rejoicing but most orderly patriots. The reverse of the picture was yet to come."

"It was universally believed that the troops were ignorant of their destination until they arrived at Civita Castellana; that, when informed of the service expected of them, a mutiny (to their credit be it said) broke out among them, which was not quelled without bloodshed; and that it was then and there they were promised the sack and pillage of unhappy Perugia as an inducement to proceed to its capture."

"Universally believed." Not an atom of testimony for all this!

"An '*ordre du jour*,'—which I have seen and believe to be genuine, (though that well-informed paper, the *Giornale di Roma*, denies its authenticity),—directs the commander of the forces to make an example of Perugia for the benefit of her sister cities, and to '*decapitare*' the rebels without mercy."

This is the order alluded to hereafter, and known to have been a malignant fabrication.

Either by highways or byways the expedition reached Foligno on Sunday the 19th, but after that their movements were so little known that it was reported they had turned off to Ancona. The fact is, however, that they left Foligno on Monday at 2 a.m.; at 3 p.m. they attacked, and by 5 p.m. resistance had ceased, and the atrocities which civilized Europe deplores commenced. The townspeople made, under the circumstances, a stout defence; but they were few in number, badly armed and commanded, and had chosen their points of defence with little judgment, and were, therefore, utterly incapable of successfully resisting a well organized band with two pieces of artillery."

So that for two hours the "townspeople" (i.e., armed people in the town, who, as we shall see, were all strangers) "stoutly resisted the troops of their lawful sovereign," slaying as many as they could, and of course some of them being slain in return. This is the case as stated by the enemy. What remains to be added in vindication of the Holy See? Put the case at Bristol or Birmingham. The rest of the long letter is entirely occupied with the fate of the writer, Perkins.

"That any danger to life or property of neutrals could arise never dawned upon me. Had the way been open, after the fight commenced, (for till then I did not believe that a collision would take place,) for escape from the town, we should have left it to avoid the sounds and sights which might assail our ears and eyes, but not from apprehension that anything could happen to us in an hotel frequented by English and Americans principally, and therefore an inviolable asylum, to be protected in all cases. Many of

your readers will recollect the Hotel de France, in the Borgo San Pietro, and its excellent landlord and landlady. They were deservedly liked by all visitors who remained at their house while enjoying the treasures of art and nature and antiquity, with which the city and its environs abound. They will easily credit the innocence of poor Signor Giuseppe Storti and his wife of any complicity in the political disturbance or the armed resistance of the victims of tyranny. He lies in a bloody grave, while she survives, with her aged mother, widowed and beggared in a summer afternoon. I can speak from personal observation of Storti's innocence of any firing from his house or throwing of tiles or stones from the roof on the heads of the aggressors. We were together till within a few minutes of his violent end, for, hearing footsteps on the roof, we mounted up and remonstrated with and drove off some boys and men who threatened to hurl bricks on the heads of the *Tedeschi* if they entered the town. On coming down he closed the shutters to prevent the ingress of marauders. We owed our safety to the providential inspiration which led us (when affairs became serious) to take refuge from any chance shot in a sheltered room on the second floor, out of which opened a long narrow closet by a door concealed in the paper-hanging, affording us a hiding-place from the onset of the infuriated soldiery, who at first spared no one. Storti was on his way, with his wife, her mother, and my manservant, to join us, when the soldiers broke into the house, murdered his two servants below, and shot him on the landing as he crossed the head of the stairs, and then despatched him with their bayonets, as he lay on the floor at the door of the room where we were assembled."

Weapons having been, as it is here admitted, thrown from his own roof upon the troops. What else than is here stated, could be expected, when the troops rushed in? How could they nicely discriminate degrees of complicity?

"At the sound of the fusillade, and the groans and cries of the wounded, we took refuge in the closet. My servant, with Madame Storti and her mother, fled into the adjoining room and fell on their knees to pray for mercy. The soldier who rushed upon him with fixed bayonet would have shown none, had he not happily avoided the fatal thrust and sprung into the assailant's arms, hugging him so closely as to pinion him for the moment, and crying out in French that he was a Frenchman, the servant of an American family who were close at hand. They forced him to discover our retreat. We were dragged out into the room and should have been instantly murdered but for one of the band, who, prepared by my servant's declaration for the presence of Americans, and being touched by the sight of my family begging for my life on their knees—for they innocently supposed that even such wretches would not injure women and children, and that the men were in the greatest danger—and, perhaps, convinced of the truth of our statement by our

non-Italian appearance, by my passport, which I held open in my hand as a flag of truce, and our earnest protestations of our nationality, and mollified by the gold which I distributed, and by the hope of promised gain if they spared us, stopped his comrades when the steel almost touched our breasts, as they rushed upon us."

We pause here to observe that we carefully insert all the malevolent rubbish, lest it should be thought that we shrunk from anything stated against the Papal forces. And although of course a government is not responsible for any incidents of a fierce and furious contest, it is satisfactory to find from such hostile testimony, that the troops desired to slay no one not actually implicated in the resistance.

"Every window was perforated with a bullet, and the adjoining houses and all the best shops broken into and robbed of their most valuable contents. Five or six bodies, in the space of as many hundred feet, between the two hotels, cumbered the blood-stained pavement. Signor Porta, who went to meet these ruffians with the gonfaliere, bearing a flag of truce, was shot down at once. His poor wife has since become a maniac, and has been carried to the hospital of Santa Margherita."

An exact counterpart of one of the terrible incidents of the massacre at Limerick, the difference being that the poor Irish were throwing stones, the Italians were firing upon the troops of their sovereign. We need hardly say that this Porta was one of the rebels!

"A poor chemist, who was reported among the killed, was just saved by an officer; his shop, however, was gutted, and his wife narrowly escaped by giving up all the money she had. But there is no need of multiplying these instances. The number of victims is not so great as has been reported—not over thirty, (of these seven were women and two or three children,) including the three murdered in the Hotel de France. On Wednesday, accompanied by Madame Storti and her mother, we started for Florence. The road was crowded with fugitives, and we could with difficulty procure post-horses for the diligence we had hired, and on Thursday, the 23rd, arrived at Florence without a change of raiment, but thankful to have escaped without loss of life."

Very good. It would have served them right if they had suffered such loss, for being so very foolish as to risk it. That is all. Nothing else follows from all that he states as to what befell themselves. And this miserable case was eked out with a little irrelevant and malicious hearsay.

And it appeared afterwards that the writer was Mr.

Perkins. And he (Perkins) quite approved of the *Times*' article; of course he did. Would so long a letter, or any letter, on the other side have been inserted? In truth, however, the facts on which the defence of the Papal Government might rest, are the admitted and notorious facts that Perugia was part of its dominion, and that persons there resisted its authority.

The *Armonia*, a Papal journal, is suspended by the free Government of Sardinia, simply because, in answer to the truculent attacks of the liberal press upon the Papal Government, it "drew a parallel" between its conduct in the affair of Perugia, and that of the Sardinian Government in the affair of Genoa. See the onesidedness of liberalism! Or rather see its essential identity with despotism. It is greatly to the credit of the *Morning Star*, a journal which on this, as on every occasion, has shown a fair and candid spirit, that it inserted the following summary of the official statement of the Papal Government.

"The *Giornale di Roma* of the 4th inst. contains a very lengthy article upon the subject of the Perugia massacre, which may be accepted as an official defence of the Papal troops engaged in that odious occurrence. It begins thus:

"The falsehoods and calumnies which have been published, and which continue to be circulated among the revolutionary public respecting the events of Perugia, force us to publish the true narrative, borrowing the details from reliable and impartial sources, so that everybody may understand what confidence is to be placed in the statements of the *Moniteur Toscan*, the *Corriere Mercantile*, the *Monitore Bolognese*, and other journals of the same kind.

"Meanwhile, the Government does not neglect fresh investigations, in order to take fitting measures in case the laws of military discipline have not been acted up to.

"We have already explained how, on the 14th of last month, some factious persons usurped legitimate power, and how, stimulated by the committees which everywhere direct revolution, they proclaimed a provisional government, at the head of which they placed men well known during the revolutions of 1830 and 1849.

"The Pontifical Government could not remain indifferent to this act of rebellion; being obliged to repress it, it had recourse to necessary and fitting means; and, not desiring to adopt rigorous measures, it wished, in the first instance, to send to Perugia the Chevalier Lattanzi, Councillor of State, in order that profiting by the grave influence he was able to exercise in that town, where for several years he had exercised the functions of Judge and afterwards those of President of the Tribunal, he should try to lead back

the rebels to order and obedience towards their Government, before exposing them to the consequence of collision with an armed force.

"M. Lattanzi assuming, therefore, the quality of patrician of Perugia, in order, above all, to give an amicable character to his mission, presented himself on the morning of the 28th before the junta of the so-called Provisional Government, in order to induce it to offer no resistance to the troops about to be sent against it by the Government, but to receive them well, and to announce that all resistance against a trained and resolute force would be useless and fatal. He did not forget to represent to them how many victims would be made if they resisted, or the evils that must of necessity fall upon the city.

"But unfortunately these warnings were not listened to. Guardabassi, Faina, and Berardi, who composed the provisional Junta, replied that the country would resist—that everybody, women, old men, and children, would throw from windows and housetops, everything they could lay hold of in order to oppose force by force.

"After having vainly employed all the means in his power, the Chevalier Lattanzi was compelled to quit the town, and surrender all authority to Colonel Schmidt, who, at the head of his troops, was stationed near the bridge of St. John.

"Scarcely had the soldiers begun to march when musket-shots were fired at them. It was for this reason that the commandant judged it unnecessary to make another appeal to the factious, fearing that they would trample under foot all laws and usages; and, having no centre of subordination, would not respect the messenger sent to them. Such is the true account of the facts which preceded the attack upon the town, and which the members of the so-called provisional Government sought to misrepresent when they took refuge in Tuscany.

"By the report of Colonel Schmidt, which has been published in the *Giornale di Roma*, every one has been able to read the details of the struggle sustained by the soldiers in order to vanquish the rebels, and re-establish order in the town. An armed conflict, and especially between soldiers and rebels, is always a regrettable circumstance, because it occasions the saddest consequences; and the responsibility of those who force a legitimate government to the grievous necessity of sustaining its rights by force, is of the gravest kind.

"The same accounts published by the leaders and defenders of the revolt of Perugia, show (see the *Moniteur Toscan* of the 27th June,) that after some hours 3000 'men came from the various quarters of Perugia, resolved to repel force by force, that they were promptly armed,' and had three Italian officers (it was said by error in the report that Colonel Cerotti was one, but it was, on the contrary, the so-called commandant of the place, Carlo Bruschi,) from

Tuscany, took the direction of the defence, by placing armed men in the proper positions.

"It is nevertheless notorious that these defenders were composed of the lower orders collected in the neighbouring districts, brought from Tuscany and seduced by money and promises. It is equally well known that the resistance was desperate; that on the night of the 19th November, muskets sent by the Commissioner Chevalier Boncampagni reached Perugia; and that those who had no arms threw upon the troops, from the doors, windows, and housetops, boiling water, flints, daggers, and other instruments of destruction.

"Is it astonishing that the soldiers, assailed by so much obstinacy, should have fought with impetuosity in order to revenge their comrades who had just fallen by their sides? And in such a struggle, in which the rebels were in the greatest strength—numbering, it is said, 5000—is it astonishing that there should have been fires, houses damaged, or that the innocent should have perished?

"Everybody who knows the history of the Paris revolution of 1848, the bombardment of Genoa the same year, and who is familiar with the deplorable consequences which arose in 1848 from the struggle between the troops of the Government and the rebels of Berlin, of Vienna, and other cities, as well as with the circumstances after the battle of Novara in 1849, must see that we must go back to the commencement of the century to find the full explanation of these events.

"The remainder of the article is wholly devoted to the peculiar cases of atrocity mentioned in former accounts, which are excused in different ways. Thus, if the blacksmith Passerini was murdered with his wife and sister-in-law, it was because a dead soldier was found in his house; the innkeeper Morini was shot because he most imprudently put his head out of the window; and the other cases are disposed of in a similar manner. The article concludes with declaring that the Government regrets the events of Perugia, but that the responsibility rests with those who commenced the conflict, and announces that the Pope has sent a large sum to relieve the sufferers."

The *Morning Star* also published the following, which shows the mendacious artifices resorted to by the revolutionists.

"The following letter has been received from Rome, dated June 30:

"The public have been much occupied for some days past with the allocation of the Pope and the events of Perugia. It is feared that the allocation will produce unpleasant consequences in the Pontifical states, and may make bad worse. Some blame it, and others approve it, as is always the case. Some very rational men

say that the Pope could not have acted otherwise under existing circumstances. The affair of Perugia has excited the wrath of the Radical Press, which accuses the Swiss of acts unworthy of soldiers of the Holy See—unworthy, indeed, of soldiers of any civilized nation. They are accused of having pillaged the houses, and of having committed several acts of cruelty. It must be recollected, however, that a town is not taken by storm, without several persons being killed or wounded, and other barbarous acts committed. Statements published at Florence and Bologna are not to be depended on. My correspondence does not coincide with the published accounts, simply because my correspondent writes only facts. The Government of the Pope is placed in a most embarrassing position, for, when it pardons, it is accused of weakness, and when its interest and its duty oblige it to be severe, the hundred mouths of report raise their voice against it. The Government has commanded that an inquiry shall be commenced with regard to the affair of Perugia, and it is said that the *Journal de Rome* will tomorrow publish the official details of this grave event. The Mazzinians, in order to excite public opinion against the Pope's Government, assert that the Pope is going to confer rewards on those most remarkable for the atrocities committed by them. They have forged the following order, addressed to Colonel Schmidt, and have distributed it among the population of Rome, as if it had been issued from the War-office:

"I, the undersigned, Deputy-Commissary at the War Office, charge your Excellency to recover the provinces of the Holy See, which a handful of factions have excited to revolt. I recommend you to use such energy as will serve as an example to others, and prevent a further revolt. I give, moreover, to your Excellency full powers to decapitate the rebels you may capture in their houses, and thus spare the Government the expense which this war may occasion. Make the revolted provinces pay the expense of feeding your soldiers, and all the cost of the expedition.

"L. MAZIO.

"This order was a pure invention, and the person whose signature was forged has denounced the forgers."

This is the "order" which the assailants of the Holy See upon this occasion refer to, as having dictated or inspired the 'atrocities' alleged to have been perpetrated, or rather inferred to have been perpetrated, from the terms of this forged order.

All that the French papers, hostile to the Papacy, (as the *Gazette de Lyons* or the *Siecle*,) could allege against the Papal troops was, that a few houses were set on fire, and a coffee-house held by the rebels was plundered. As if houses held by armed rebels were to be deemed sacred!

Or as if a coffee-house so held was not justly liable to refresh the troops employed to reduce a revolt! Well might the *Register* say that never was a revolted city reduced with less loss of life, or a greater absence of excesses. Witness the years 1798 and 1858.

“By half-past seven the town was cleared. The insurgents mostly fled back to Tuscany, whence they came. The statistics of this fight of three hours, in the streets and houses, between 5,000 rebels and 2,000 regular troops, are—killed 10 soldiers and 50 insurgents—wounded, 35 soldiers and 100 insurgents; 120 prisoners and 3,000 muskets and ammunition, sent to Perugia by the Tuscan Government remain in the hands of the Pontifical authorities. A contribution of 22,000 dollars had been levied on the property of the chiefs of the revolt; and Perugia is liberated from the miserable crew of its invaders. Colonel Schmidt, in his proclamation to the inhabitants, announcing a military government, and inviting them to assist him in keeping the peace, strongly assures them of the discipline of his troops, and a letter of a Swiss officer in the *Chroniqueur de Fribourg*, speaks especially also of the constant care imposed with this object on the Pontifical officers. Those who have the pleasure of knowing Colonel Schmidt (a religious, brave, and faithful officer,) will not need to be assured of his firmness and judgment under trying circumstances; may he long enjoy his well-earned honours.”

We need not say that not a word of this triumphant defence appeared in the *Times* or the *Telegraph*, or any other of the papers which coarsely calumniate and revile the Holy See.

The following is a translation of the letter referred to in the *Register*, as having reached it from the Vicar-General of Perugia:—

“Illmo Signore,—The true accounts of the events of Perugia will be found in the article which we send you, extracted from the official newspaper of Rome, (which, perhaps, has also reached London by some other means,) and reprinted in the newspaper of Perugia, the *Osservatore del Trasimeno*, on the 6th of July, No. 58. We, who are witnesses of the whole, assure you of its exactness. We add a few details to correct the errors contained in the correspondence of the *Times*. The American gentleman, Perkins, who is its writer, keeping to his apartments in the inn during the struggle, and having immediately left on the following morning for Florence, had been unable to see little or nothing with his own eyes. He has written under the impression of what he has heard from others, and probably from some one of the very men who compromised themselves, and who taking to flight, took with himself the road to Florence. A

courteous English gentleman (Mr. Ross Wedensbury,) who has a villa outside Perugia, had invited Mr. Perkins to leave the town on that day, and take up his abode with him ; but the latter refused, and wished to be on the scene of events. We leave unnoticed the many errors contained in the correspondence relating to the antecedents of the revolt, the coming from Rome of the foreign regiment in the service of the Holy See, the dogged resistance of the rebels, and the assault of the city. Enough is said on these points in the article which we send you. We confine ourselves to what took place in the inn where Mr. Perkins was lodging. This inn was the last post of defence which the soldiers met with after passing along a line of buildings of the extent of about five hundred yards, nearly all of which they were obliged to take by assault, because the insurgents had concealed themselves within them ; and from them assailed the troops with shots and stones. The roof, of iron itself, was occupied by a number of armed men, who assailed the soldiers with bullets and tiles ; by which a sergeant was killed, and an officer wounded. Inside the inn, not on the floor inhabited by Mr. Perkins, other armed men were firing from the windows. The enraged soldiers rushed in, and killed the inn-keeper and two servant men, found with arms in their hands. The American family, the hostess and the female servants were saved, because one of the soldiers, named Conrad, perceiving that they were foreigners, placed himself as a sentry to guard the door, and remained there all night, to guarantee their persons, telling them that this was the order of his captain. The American offered him, as a gift, a purse of money, but he refused it, answering that he was doing his duty. The following morning, having gone to the barracks, and finding in the hands of his companions a few articles of value belonging to Mr. Perkins, he took them and brought them back to him. Moved by so much kindness, the American forced him to accept a bill of exchange, of the value of about £15, which the good soldier deposited in the hands of his commander. It should be remembered that the individual who performed so honourable and virtuous an act, belongs also to the army against which Mr. Perkins wrote in such harsh terms ! He has moreover laid a claim before the Pontifical government through his ambassador in Rome, for damage done to his luggage. The government ordered immediately a verification. Proceedings were instituted on the events which had taken place at the inn, and from them are taken the details which we give you. Several articles were recovered, and have already been restored to him ; nor has it been neglected to provide beside for a full indemnity."

Now, let it be observed, that Mr. Perkins, in his subsequent letters, never ventured to question these statements, nor were they ever controverted.

"It is true that the inn, having been taken by assault, was

wrecked by the impetuosity and rage of the troops. But this misfortune happened only in the houses from which attacks had come, and it is wholly false that there were orders, or express permission, to rob and sack, as he has asserted, or that this was done in any part of the town beyond the streets in which resistance was encountered. Indeed, the officers exerted themselves strenuously to prevent it everywhere, and many persons owe their safety to their vigilance. Much greater disasters might have occurred, considering the doggedness and treachery displayed by the rebels, against the troops sent to restore order. The soldiers never saw any of their enemies in front of them; all was done in concealment, from behind walls and barricades, from roofs, from windows, and other places of security. These were the men who compromised peaceful citizens, by entering with violence into their houses to fire upon the soldiers. With all this, in the long and sanguinary resistance of more than three hours, there have been found among the dead only twenty of the citizens, while the soldiers number eleven. The fact is no doubt deplorable; but the fault cannot but fall upon those who had raised, on the 14th ult., the banner of rebellion, to the sorrow and disapprobation of the great mass of the citizens, and without any participation whatever of the municipal assembly and magistracy; and upon those who afterwards, to crown their felony, collected and armed men bought with money and seduced for the purpose of resisting the public forces; although the Legate of Perugia, from the town where he had taken refuge, using the intervention of prudent persons, (and later the Holy Father also, in his benignity, by means of a Councillor of State sent from Rome,) had endeavoured to induce the rebels to return to order before the forces arrived. From an order of the day of the French General in Rome, it was well known that the troops had left the capital, on the 14th ult., and during the six days which they took to reach Perugia, there was abundant time for surrender. But all was useless, owing to the acts of a few factious enemies of the Holy See and of every legitimate power, animated with the spirit of destruction and anarchy. Such are the details which we give you by order of our Right Rev. Bishop, to answer your honoured letter of the 4th inst. Rejoicing in the earnestness you show for the Catholic cause and the defence of the Holy See, we recommend ourselves to your prayers, and united with you in spirit in the bond of Christian charity, we profess for you all esteem and consideration.

By commission of the Right Rev. Bishop

DE LAURENZI, P. Vic. Gen.

FRANCESCO GAGGIA, Superior of the Priests of the
Mission of Saint Vincent de Paul.

Perugia, July 14, 1859."

Here, then, we have an authentic statement of the case, completely exculpating the Holy See from anything

beyond the necessary vindication of its authority, and a statement confirmed by its enemies.

The editor of the "Register" accompanied this letter with the following shrewd and pertinent remarks:—

"The newspapers announce that Mr. Stockton, the resident minister of the United States at Rome, has struck his flag, and after taking down the emblazoned 'Stars and Stripes,' from the front of his hotel, has retired to Leghorn. This seems to indicate a desire to make of Mr. Perkins, the redoubted hero of the dark closet at Perugia, a sort of Don Pacifico. It is to be observed, however, that these strong measures have been resorted to, not in consequence of the refusal by the Roman government of any demand made by him, but solely because he has made a demand, and the authorities after enquiring into the facts have restored whatever of Mr. Perkins' property could be recovered, and fully indemnified him for the remainder. He has, it seems, thought fit to prejudge the case, not more decidedly, however, we are compelled to admit, than most persons in this country. Our readers are, we think, so far an exception to the general state of mind of their countrymen, as to prefer to know something of the facts before they make up their minds upon them. This we can to-day enable them to do, having been honoured with an important letter from two eminent ecclesiastics on the spot, the Vicar-General of Perugia, and the Superior of the Fathers of St. Vincent de Paul, who have allowed us to authenticate it by the publication of their names. The article enclosed, and which has also reached us, is the same, an abstract of which we last week gave. The result of the whole is, that the rebellion can hardly be called in any sense the act of the inhabitants, the great mass of the slain are found to have been Florentine 'sympathizers.' It would have been almost incredible, if not incontestably proved, that in such a struggle only twenty of the inhabitants should have fallen. All experience shows the great probability that many, possibly even the whole of these may have been mere spectators of the bloody scene, and taking no part in it. Yet, had they all been actively engaged in it, they fall far short of the for-eigners actually killed in the struggle, not to mention those who saved themselves by flight. It is truly wonderful, and most creditable to the soldiers, that, under the circumstances, so few excesses were committed, maddened as they were by being made a mark from the houses, and obliged to force them one by one in succession. Especially their treatment of Mr. Perkins and his party seems to have been most exemplary. That gentleman and the ladies under his care were in the midst of the bloody scene by his own deliberate choice. What may be thought of his discretion is an open question—that he had the most singular good fortune cannot be doubted. Once at least, beyond all expectation, he has thrust himself uncalled into the midst of the danger, and has escaped. We are far from

recommending him to repeat the experiment anywhere. But if resolved on doing so, we would earnestly exhort him to limit it to the States of the Church. Above all, he will hardly get off so easily if he attempts it in any part of the British dominions. Her Majesty's soldiers are brave and honourable men, but we are far from wishing that either ourselves or those who are most dear to us should fall in with them at a moment when they have stormed a rebellious town, held against them by foreign sympathizers, and in houses from which they have been annoyed by firing, unauthorised by the laws of war. But not to mention extreme cases like this, did Mr. Perkins ever see or hear any accurate account of what took place after the storming of Badajos or St. Sebastian? both of which the British army entered as friends to the inhabitants, and their deliverers from the iron grasp of the veterans of Napoleon. It will little bear repeating here, but it may suggest to him topics for very hearty thanksgiving in the review of his late escape."

After the delay of nearly a month Mr. Perkins essays to answer the defence thus put forward; but, strange to say, for the most part, and entirely so as to all that is material, he left it unanswered, and confined himself almost entirely to the editor's comments thereon, and strictures upon himself. He wrote thus:—

"Florence, August 20, 1859.

"Mr. Editor,—Your paper of the 23rd July, containing a letter from two distinguished Roman Catholic prelates at Perugia, and an editorial article thereon, is before me. Will you allow me to correct some inaccuracies in both? Your allusion to Don Pacifico was as amusing to me as to your usual readers. I fancy we have little in common but the P's at the beginning of our names, and the significance of a peaceable disposition, which in my case at least, does not 'keep the promise to the ear and break it to the hope.' And *imprimis*, the United States Minister, *pres le St. Siege* (Mr. Stockton) neither took down the arms of the Legation, struck the stars and stripes, or indulged in any such melodramatic exhibition. He was on the point of leaving Rome for sea bathing at Leghorn, when he received my letter of the 21st from Perugia. He at once sought an interview with Cardinal Antonelli, and did not leave till, in the following week, when, being assured that the government would accede to his just demands for indemnity and punishment of the guilty parties, he found himself at liberty to pursue his journey to Leghorn, where he remained, and received through his Chargé at Rome the satisfaction he had asked for. I did not leave Perugia until the 22nd, and both before, during, and after the attack, had ample opportunities of arriving at the truth than your correspondents give me credit for. The state of health of one of the ladies of my family prevented my accepting Mrs. Ross' (of Bladenburg) most hospitable invitation to visit her at the

Villa di Monti. Touching Storti's innocence, the neutrality of the Hotel de France, and other minor points, my letter in the *Times* of July 2nd is sufficient. The draft which you state I gave to Conrad the soldier, for £15, was presented to him, that he might purchase a *remplacant*, and leave a service which he did not like; this is not the only benefit I trust to render him. One of the marked features of the case is, that no warning was given to neutrals to leave the country. Surely the sack and pillage, the murder of innocent men and women, ought not to find an apologist in England, when it is freely condemned in Italy. I send you a pamphlet, which *though* published by the late Junta of Perugia, contains a true statement of the affair. (*sic.*) The report of Signor Monari admits its veracity.(?) The letter of the excellent Bishop of Cortona will abundantly repay perusal; showing that a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic can see things as they are, and boldly condemn the wrong. Every one must regret that the Perugians should, in a moment of enthusiasm, have made so inopportune a movement, and at the same time must admit that they were not without excuse, and did not deserve such *excessive* punishment. We did not wait to be prompted before giving hearty thanks for the great mercies vouchsafed to us in our remarkable escape, and are quite as well aware of reasons for gratitude as ever the editor of the *Weekly Register* could desire."

Now it will be seen that in this remarkable and valuable letter, (we mean valuable as regards the vindication of the Holy See,) not one of the material statements in the letter of these ecclesiastics is controverted. And so far as regards the merits of the case, their statement therefore is to be taken as admitted, as, indeed, it could hardly but be, seeing that it contained little of anything in addition to the most notorious facts. It was quite unnecessary, then, for the *Register* to adduce further evidence. It only remained to comment on the facts thus admitted, as it did thus most ably.

"Mr. Perkins's corrections of certain alleged 'inaccuracies' in the letter we published from Perugia are so comparatively unimportant, that, by implication, they confirm all that was really material in the statements of our two very reverend correspondents. And now for our own 'inaccuracies.' The only one which Mr. Perkins himself puts right is in reference to the alleged conduct of the American Minister at Rome. It is one about which we are glad to be set right. It was, of course, not ours. In making it we simply followed the statements of the public journals. The *Giornale di Roma* contradicted the report, and we have already reproduced that contradiction. We thought it at the time extremely improbable that the American Minister should have acted in the absurd

manner attributed to him. The American diplomatic service has, on all occasions, acted abroad loyally up to the principles of religious impartiality and toleration professed by the Home Government. We only wish we could say as much of our own. The conduct of our Consul at Rome, the late Mr. Freeborn, in 1848-9 presented a deplorable contrast to that of the then representative of the United States. Mr. Stockton's predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Cass, during the troubles of that period, not only abstained from all interference in favour of the rebels, but even dismissed from their posts several American Consuls in Italy who had presumed to disobey his instructions in that respect. Let it be noted that the great American Republic not only finds it necessary to have itself represented at the Court of Rome, but to be represented in such a manner, and by such men as shall maintain relations of confidence and good will with the Papal government even in the hour of its temporal adversity. We thank Mr. Perkins for having drawn the attention of our readers to this gratifying fact."

And here something is due even to Perkins. He at least wrote out frankly, not anonymously, and showed every disposition to discuss the matter fairly, unlike those cowardly anonymous assassins of character, in the *Times* newspaper, "our own correspondents."

We beg attention to the Register's comments upon the only material part of Mr. Perkins's last letter, that in which, shrinking from a maintenance of his *own* personal testimony, he refers to the "true statement of the case put forward by the 'Junta.'"

"For the correction of any remaining inaccuracies of which we may have been guilty, Mr. Perkins refers us to a very suspicious authority indeed—a pamphlet (which he politely forwards) published by the late Revolutionary Junta of Perugia, the very men, in fact, who organised the revolt, who fomented the mischief till it resulted in bloodshed, who were the ringleaders in resistance to their lawful sovereign, and who now stand arraigned before Christendom as the perpetrators of one of the most stupid and purposeless acts of treason ever recorded. The bare denial of these four baffled and beaten traitors, unsupported save by Mr. Perkins's endorsement, is the sole authority on which we are expected to discredit the truth of what our Very Rev. correspondents, by commission of the Right Rev. the Bishop, have communicated to us!

"We have read the pamphlet carefully, and pondered its contents; and we find it to require very little remark. It is a tissue of rabid, declamatory abuse of the Pontifical government, 'writ in very choice Italian;' but it proves nothing, except the intense hatred which the four Perugians, whose names are subscribed to it,

feel towards the Holy Father and his government. But appended to it are three 'Documents,' of which we have something to say.

"Mr. Perkins tells us that 'The Report of Signor Monari admits its (the pamphlet's) veracity.' Signor Monari was Sub-Military Intendant of the Expeditionary corps at Perugia, and the document referred to is one of the three appended to the pamphlet. In it Signor Monari reports to his chief at Rome all the circumstances connected with the reduction of Perugia. We look in vain in it for any 'admission' as to the veracity of the revolutionary pamphlet. This is scarcely surprising. It could hardly be expected that an official of the Papal government should 'admit the veracity' of a pamphlet consisting mainly of such compliments as the following as applied to his government:—

"*'Cotali enormita, quasi nuove nella storia delle guerre de' nostri tempi civili, dovevano almeno altamente riprovarsi dal governo che ne è stato la causa, almeno per pudore, almeno per allontanare da se l'infamia di che cuoprirebbero qualunque governo barbaro, nonchè un governo di chierichi, di ministri dell' altare. Ma il governo romano è più barbaro de' barbari; egli ha l'impudenza di legittimare colla sua autorità, con eloge e con premi, scelleratezze degne degli Unni e dei Saraceni.'*

"And so forth. Strange, indeed, we thought, that a Roman officer should have avouched the 'veracity' of statements like these. But our wonder was increased, or rather it was diverted from Signor Monari to Mr. Edward N. Perkins, when we compared the date of the 'report' with that of the pamphlet. Will it be believed that while Signor Monari dates his report 'Perugia, June 25, 1859,' the pamphlet, the veracity of which, according to Mr. Perkins, he admits in the said report, is dated Florence, the 2nd of July, 1859? Unless on the supposition that Signor Monari possessed the faculty of second sight to enable him to endorse as veracious that which did not come into being till ten days afterwards, we are utterly puzzled to account for Mr. Perkins's assertion that Signor Monari admits the veracity of the pamphlet. Did Mr. Perkins read the pamphlet and the report himself, or did he trust to the assertion of some revolutionary friend?"

This was a pretty decisive demolition of the "true statement" and its supposed confirmation. Truly might the Register observe:—

"After this we might reasonably claim to be excused from noticing any farther remark of Mr. Perkins, either in reference to ourselves, our correspondents, or the affairs of Italy. But there are two other points that are worth a passing notice or two before we finally dismiss this affair. The military report confirms in all material points the statements of our correspondents. Ample time had been given for surrender; and the obstinate resistance made by the insurgents proves that the attack was not unexpected. Mr.

Perkins complains that no warning was given to neutrals.(!) Did he expect one specially addressed to himself? What right he may have had to the character of neutral is not very clear from the whole tenor of his conduct in the affair. The leaders themselves, too, complain bitterly of the want of notice of the attack, and also of the vigour of the troops in storming and taking those houses, from the windows and roofs of which they were annoyed by a galling fire, no enemy being visible."

Here we see that the troops had been forced to resort to the tactics of the "Duke" in London.

"Do these gentlemen imagine that the government which, by their revolt and their offer of annexation to Piedmont, they had set at open defiance, was bound to give them such notice as must have defeated its own plans? And as to the rough and ready proceedings of the military when the fight was once fairly begun, they of all men ought to know best that as 'revolutions are not made with rose-water,' so neither are they put down with showers of bon-bons. Those who provoke the stern arbitrement of war are not entitled to complain if the ordeal go against them. Mr. Perkins will tell them that the free and enlightened government of the United States has, or lately had, an army encamped in rather unpleasant proximity to its rebellious citizens at the Great Salt Lake, which army it will not hesitate, if need be, to use with a promptitude little inferior to that displayed by General Schmidt at Perugia. The fact is, the time has passed when (as in the days of the amiable Louis Philippe) an insurrectionary mob might count on the forbearance of the regular troops to slaughter those troops at its pleasure. The science of street-fighting now forms a regular part of military tactics, and the only chance in future for the mob will be to prove itself really superior in generalship and in actual force to the champions of the government. Another document appended to the pamphlet is a note, but not professing exactness, of the slayings and plunderings alleged to have been committed during the assault of Perugia. One of these is the sack of the Benedictine monastery, which is stated to have been gutted; the books and MSS. of the library, and the sacred vessels and vestments of the church carried off; an *abate* stripped of his pectoral cross and chain; a monk and a domestic wounded, the latter mortally. No actors are named of this and other outrages, but we are wished to conclude that it was the Pope's soldiers, those very soldiers who had piously prepared for the battle on the morrow by prayer and confession ere they marched to the scene of action. We have our own opinion, and so, we suspect, have our readers, as to whether the soldiers were the real criminals, or the lawless foreign mob who had invaded Perugia before the struggle, and who took advantage of the confusion to work their will. The statement of our correspondents remains uncontradicted—that only twenty of the townspeople fell in the

desperate struggle. The rest of the slain were strangers. This one fact speaks volumes."

Most undoubtedly. It is, in truth, the pith and marrow of the whole case, and shows that these cities of Italy have been molested by bands of ruffians, sent probably from Sardinia, and that the measures taken by the Holy See were purely protective.

"One word as to the other point. Mr. Perkins alludes to the Bishop of Cortona's Pastoral. This forms the third and last document in the appendix to the pamphlet. We have perused it carefully, and we pronounce the attempt to make the Bishop favour the cause of revolution to be the crowning impudence of the whole. The Pastoral of the good prelate is a pious and affectionate exhortation to obedience to the powers that be, a Christian duty which it sets forth strongly, and enforces by reference to Holy Scripture, thus condemning in the strongest manner the insurrectionary movement of the conspirators.

"We have now done with Mr. Perkins. His letter is as little creditable to himself as it is complimentary to us. He has either overlooked himself, or expected us to overlook the fact—that in professing to correct our inaccuracies he has referred us to a source that not only materially confirms our statements, but convicts himself of material and flagrant perversions of fact."

Nothing, surely, requires to be added to this most satisfactory vindication of the conduct not only of the Papal Government, but of the Papal troops in the affair.

Ever since the conduct of the Holy Father has been in the same spirit, and marked by a firm resolution to maintain, as sacred, his temporal dominion. In September we read in the *Times*,—

"On his own side the Pope is not unmindful of those who have done him good service. He has struck a medal in honour of the Swiss who subdued Perugia with fire and the sword. The medals bear on one side '*Perugia expugnata*;' on the other, '*Ad benemerenti*.'"

And a little afterwards a correspondent from Bologna, under date of the 27th ult., says:—

"It is said that there is a corps of Pontifical troops amounting to 8,000 men of all arms . . . This collection of mercenaries is said to form an army of from 10,000 to 12,000 men, intended to restore the Papal authority in the revolted provinces."

Thus, then, the Supreme Pontiff, not a whit influenced by the storm of obloquy by which he had been assailed,

not yielding to any weak sensibilities on account of the sad results which must ensue, and not shrinking from the responsibility, resolved, with all his available means, to uphold his lawful authority remembering the words of Scripture, that the just ruler beareth not the sword in vain, but as a terror to evil doers.

Nor did the Pontiff shrink any more than any of his predecessors, from confronting even imperial menaces, and maintaining his just rights against the ruler of the mightiest of empires and the commander of victorious armies. We read in the Times of a date so recent as Sept. 13.

“ My last letter gave you intelligence of an interview between Cardinal Antonelli and the Duke de Gramont. The answer of His Holiness to the Duke was precisely that of the Cardinals. On the separation of the Romagna being proposed, with the condition of an annual tribute being paid in recognition of the sovereignty of the Holy Father, he answered that he neither would nor could dismember the patrimony of the Church. If France and Austria had resolved on not interfering for the defence of the head of the Church, he confided in the providence of God, which would supply the means of reducing his rebellious subjects to their duty, and of keeping the Romans in order, even should the French leave the capital. When his subjects return to their duty, the Holy Father will grant such concessions as he thinks proper, ‘*di suo proprio móto*,’ and not on the moral compulsion of diplomacy, and least of all on that of rebellious subjects. This was the firm and decided will not only of the Pope, but of the Cardinals who were questioned, being six in number, to whom the Pope must submit, just as he did when he granted more liberal reforms, which, as they had been abused, his subjects had lost every right to expect. Consistently with this answer the greatest efforts are being made for bursting into the Romagna.”

Thus, then, the affair of Perugia was no party or isolated act ; it was the deliberate act of the Pontiff, part of the settled policy and line of conduct he had marked out for himself, and was resolved at all risks to pursue, simply because he was satisfied that it was the path of duty, a part, although a painful part of the duty of sovereignty, to protect the loyal from the tyranny of a truculent and malignant faction.

The Papal Government, still menaced by the sinister machinations of Sardinia, proceeded to enlist troops from the forces of the discarded Dukes. The Sardinian Gov-

ernment absolutely had the insolence to remonstrate against this. A Turin letter in the *Union*, said :

“ The military enlistments, which have been lately said to be made by the Papal Government, have furnished a pretext to the Piedmontese Ministry to remonstrate against the conduct of the Pope, who has, it is said, enlisted into his regiments several hundreds of Austrian subjects, to oppose the bands of Garibaldi. As Piedmont has now no representative at the Court of Vienna, these remonstrances were sent to the Cabinet of the Tuileries, and to that of Prussia. I am assured very positively that the Prussian envoy received the communication with a very bad grace, as it did not appear to him founded in justice. He reminded the Piedmontese Government that Austria, in March last, having made a similar remonstrance against Piedmont, and that measure having had the support of England, the Piedmontese Government replied that it considered itself fully entitled to act as it had done, and that since the young men who had been enlisted were Italians, it was of no consequence their being subjects of another State. The Piedmontese Government was reminded of its own reasons for defending itself against a pretension which it considered exorbitant, but an unexpected reply, which has caused much surprise in the diplomatic world, has been given by the Chevalier Dabormida—namely, that the Piedmontese Government considered itself in a state of war against all the sovereigns of Central Italy, and particularly against the Power whose subjects were sought for to form part of the troops of the Pope. The Roman Chancellery, having been also informed of this strange pretension, had no difficulty in replying, and I can state that the Duke de Gramont, having been requested to support the remonstrances of Sardinia, politely refused. Will you believe it? An application was also made to England, who, if she has not completely changed since the month of April last, when she supported the remonstrances of Austria against Piedmont, will give the same reply to the Cabinet of Turin as the Duke de Gramont and the Prussian envoy.”

Nothing could serve more strongly to show the sinister designs of the Sardinian Government. Why should it object to the Papal Government enlisting forces to defend itself? The forces thus enlisted were many of them Italian; but what if they were Austrian? The Piedmontese Government was at that very time availing itself of the resources of Lombardy and Tuscany; and how much more affinity is there between Lombardy and Savoy than between Austria and Italy? The truth is, however, that in the case of the Papacy the objection involves a fallacy. For the Papacy, the head of Christendom, is of

no country, or rather of every Christian country, as all are alike bound to protect it.

But observe the inconsistency of the enemies of the Holy See. Foreigners, or strangers, from Piedmont or Lombardy, are to be allowed to invade or intrigue in the Papal States, and the Papal Government is not to be at liberty to obtain assistance, even from any other part of Italy.

It has been scornfully said that the Pontifical government had not a sufficient military force to recover possession of the Legations. What could that matter if the government were not to be permitted to use such forces for the maintenance of its authority? Yet when it does so it is assailed with the vilest abuse. Such is the treatment it receives from your "liberals." First, they reproach it with "weakness" in not having or not using a military force, and when it does use such a force it is overwhelmed with obloquy.

There is undoubtedly far more colour for the reproach of "weakness" than any other that is aimed at the Papal government. It is, in fact, the only charge for which there is a colour, and for that there is. It is "weak" in two senses: no doubt it is weak in respect to the strength of its military forces, and it is weak in respect of its moral inability or aversion to use it. But both the one and the other are strange subjects of reproach, since the first is its misfortune and the other is its merit. It is strange subject of reproach that it should have been so remorselessly pillaged by the French revolutionists, and the imperial spoiler, the first Napoleon; that its revenues were anticipated, and its finances were embarrassed, and the funds for the support of a strong army therefore absorbed. Least of all is it a decent matter of reproach from a Frenchman, a revolutionist, or a liberal. It is the reproach of the spoiler against the spoiled. It is reducing a man to poverty and then reviling him for it. And, on the other hand, it is a strange subject of reproach against the Papal government, that it should be mild, paternal, and indisposed to severity, especially against political offenders, insomuch that it is reluctant to punish with death offences always so punishable in England or in France. Least of all is this a decent topic of reproach on the part of its rebellious subjects, who profit by its clemency, and repay it not merely with treason but with calumny.

No doubt it is of the nature of an ecclesiastical government to be under great disadvantages in contending with bad men. In that respect the better a government is the weaker it must be; for to a certain extent, in dealing with bad men, you require those harsher and sterner measures which men shrink from, just in proportion as they are mild, humane, and good. It is actually made matter for reproach against the Papal government that they should even restore its authority in revolted cities at the risk of a little bloodshed. And all the odium of the sad results of actual conflict are cast upon it. Now is it supposed that the Papal government is indifferent to this consideration? Its enemies are too well aware that it is not indifferent but keenly sensitive to it, and they too well know how to take advantage of it. The Papal government, in truth, labours under this immense disadvantage, that its enemies know that, to a great extent, they may count upon impunity. Its foreign foes from its military weakness; its domestic traitors from its mildness and humanity. But is this a decent subject of reproach against it? What, reproach it for that mildness, that humanity, that tenderness of blood, which induce them merely to imprison traitors whom we should hang? or revile it for weakness merely because its strength is moral and not military?

We repeat that this mildness and this military weakness give the colour to the only charge against it, that has any colour of truth about it at all. For the military weakness, too, we must admit that there is another reason than its poverty, a reason which Ranke and other writers point out as applying to the Papacy even in an age when it was far more powerful than it is now. The Papal government, from its ecclesiastical character, can never be able to offer military men a career in its service. This is what the *Times* meant in its celebrated leader on the 4th January, which opened the war against the Papacy. "The Italian youth have no career; the career of arms is closed against them." In a certain sense this is false, but in the sense of a career of arms it is true, for the Papal government is, by its character, restricted to a purely defensive policy, in which there can never be that career which is opened to military men in any other service. In our own there is almost always some part of the globe in which "active service" is going on. In France there is always Algeria, while we have India. But a government which never can

use arms until it is actually attacked, can offer no stirring service, no brilliant "career." In proportion as a ruler is unscrupulous, if he only be skilful, is the hope of such a career likely to be realized. And rightly viewed, it not only is not a reproach, but is a matter of merit for the Papal government that it should have no such career to offer. We know, indeed, what human nature is, especially under the aspect it assumes in Italy, in the Romagna, where the population has always been warlike. Naturally enough many of them dislike a government which has no military career to offer. And this is a misfortune in more respects than one. Not only does the Papal government lose the support of the more bold, stirring, and martially disposed men, but their energies are attracted by and enlisted in the service of an Italian state inimical to it, seeking its spoliation, thirsting for its destruction with all the fell spirit of rapacity and revenge. Thus it was that the Papal government lost Bologna and Perugia; thus it was that it found such difficulties in recovering them.

Nothing is more important to a due and just judgment upon these events than to disabuse the mind of the false impression that the bulk of the population of the Papal States are opposed to, or disaffected towards the Papal government. This impression is natural enough to those whom prejudice predisposes to a conclusion which could not be come to upon any sufficient reflection or attention to the facts. The Times itself now admits by implication that the majority of the population took no part in the revolutionary movement, and says, truly enough, that such movements are always the work of an active minority. Well, but what becomes of the popular theory? The fact is, that the idea of such a manifestation of truly popular will as is always presupposed on these occasions rests upon an obvious fallacy. It is practically impossible to collect the opinion of the majority. The Times itself is obliged to admit that the movements are carried by what it calls an "active and intelligent minority."

Why should it be supposed that the party anxious for revolution is particularly intelligent, or that their "activity" is the result only of "intelligence?" Those very expressions denote the foregone conclusion, and the dominance of prejudice. The favourers of revolution reason in a circle. Those who are opposed to the Papal system it is assumed must be peculiarly "intelligent." Why so?

Simply because your "liberal" writers don't like it, but detest it. There you see the egotism which is really of the essence of all despotism, and detect the spuriousness of your so-called "liberalism," which is but another name for selfish intolerance. Liberalism is, in fact, the desire tyrannically to suppress a system it happens to hate, against the wishes of those whose happiness it promotes. The party who desire the revolution the liberals choose to call intelligent, and then demand that its will should overpower the wishes of the majority. What is that but tyranny?

Its own correspondent in Lombardy long ago discovered and announced that the country population were not favourable to the Sardinians. On that subject we happen to have our own means of information. A friend of the writer's was in Garibaldi's corps and went through the campaign. He declares that the "people detested them, and would not give them a drink of water if they could help it." This quite tallies with the earlier accounts of the *Times* correspondent; it has recently got another Italian correspondent, one of the revolutionary party, but even he has had to complain of the "apathy" of the people in Tuscany. To dispel this "apathy" Garibaldi was summoned to "organize" an army in central Italy. What that word means in the vocabulary of the revolutionary party our readers can judge by turning to the proclamations of Garibaldi in Lombardy and Naples, where they will see it means an arbitrary conscription enforced by a reign of terror.

And we know from our friend that the officers in his corps were so unwilling to act, that he had one of his colonels tried by court martial, and we believe, shot, for declining to lead his regiment against the Austrians. Most of the respectable part of the corps left him gladly the moment the peace was signed, and the French Emperor, or at least the French journals, have hardly attempted to conceal, that one reason for the premature peace was the discovery of the delusions that had been practised upon the world, as to the eagerness of the Italian people for revolution. Those who remained with Garibaldi, or, rather, those who resorted to him after the peace, were the scum of Italy, the dregs of his own corps, added to the refuse of every city he passed through, with, perhaps, a sprinkling of ardent and deluded young men,

possessed with the phantom of military glory and love of liberty, ignorant that they are helping to set up an odious tyranny.

It is all very well to call such a vile faction active and intelligent. There is no reason why those who are active in revolution should be deemed so very intelligent. The people who take the least prominent part in politics in any country, comprise the most reflective, the most intelligent, and the best informed of the inhabitants. It is proverbial that those who are most active in parochial or municipal politics, are often precisely those who are most shallow-headed, the least intelligent, the worst informed; not seldom the least honest portion of the community. Certainly, in every country, political agitators are not usually among the very worst or best of men. On the contrary, they are often artful, needy men, seeking to raise themselves into a spurious notoriety, which flatters their vanity, and which they deem fame; we see this plainly enough at home, and hold such gentry rather cheaply. Abroad we see things differently. We see through the mists of prejudice and bigotry. That a man hates the Papacy, is enough to justify rebellion and consecrate any crime. It is assumed that those who are intent in such a cause must be intelligent.

The Tuscan correspondent of the *Daily News*, writing from Florence on the 9th, said among other things:—

“The people (i. e. the revolutionary portion speaking in their name,) hate and despise the priests even more in 1859 than they did in 1849—and if the prelates persist in the path on which they have entered, (i. e. in opposing revolution,) a National Assembly, representing all the Italian provinces, will declare the incompatibility of Catholicism with the liberty, independence, and unity of Italy.”

That is, with ‘liberalism,’ with which, no doubt, it is incompatible, simply because it is inimical to every form of tyranny.

“The Pope omits no efforts to widen the chasm which separates the clergy from the people. Not long ago, he even sent to all the Bishops and Archbishops of Tuscany very precise and detailed instructions recommending to them the cause of the Austro-Lorraine dynasty, and prescribing to them that they should do all they could to promote its restoration.”

Why not?—It is not in Ireland only that priests are prosecuted.

“During the last few days the arrest of certain priests has taken place, and several others are now under prosecution. It was high time that this should be done since, in the provinces especially, they were already raising, as it were, the standard of revolt—[‘As it were.’ Revolt from revolution! As usual, recourse is had to calumny,] and after abusing most unworthily the opportunities which they derive from the confessional, and from private religious conferences, they were beginning openly to carry on anti-national propagandism from the pulpit to the altar. As the Government does not regard with great confidence its *delegati*, or commissaries of police, or its agents, and subordinate agents of vigilance (public safety); the gendarmes have been ordered to attend in the churches during every sermon, catechising, or exposition of scripture, and to report thereon to the superior authorities.”

That is, the clergy are to be beset with spies, and harassed with prosecutions, all in the name of liberty; to prevent them from using their just influence to oppose revolution. The propagandism of liberalism is to have full sway; that of the clergy is to be stopped.

The circular of the rebel government to the Ecclesiastical authorities, dated August 22, declared that,

“Any sort of doubts as to its legitimacy, and any sort of hesitation to follow it in the path opened by the will of the country, would be not only acts of rebellion against the ruling authority, but also acts of treason against the nation, and that it would consequently prevent and repress all kinds of machinations and criminal attempts, and would punish the conspirators without regard to their birth or social position.”

And the correspondent of the “Daily News” goes on to mention the protest of the Bishops and of the four Archbishops against this circular, and their request for its withdrawal, but he says that—

“It is fit that the menaces therein contained should not now remain empty words, but that the authors of the protest should learn that obedience to the will of the country is the first of a citizen’s duties.”

“Thus,” says the *Tablet*, “a revolutionary government which, by its own profession, claims no right to exist except by virtue of public opinion—which claims to have rightfully succeeded the late government solely because public opinion forsook the late government and pronounced itself in favour of the present usurpers, claims also the right to suppress public opinion, and to punish as treason ‘any sort of hesitation’ on the part of the public to follow in its path.”

We have never observed that the *Siecle* or any other revolutionary journal, has denied that the emissaries of Sardinia have been employed to wrest the cities and territories of the Holy See from its dominion. And if so, who can say that the 'revolts' can lay claim even to the title of "revolutions?" They were really and truly piratical invasions of a treacherous power, employing bands of armed ruffians to fraternize with the baser portion of the people, to establish a reign of terror, and, under cover of revolution to extend its own domination.

From such domination the Pope had a right to rescue his subjects; and it was not less his duty than his right. Even supposing the regular Sardinian rule substituted for the *regime* of revolution, it would have been a sad change for his subjects; a change from the lightest to the heaviest taxation; from the mildest to the harshest rule; from freedom to oppression. The 'repressive' system of the Sardinian Government is as severe as that of France. And under cover of that system alone has it been able to prosecute its unscrupulous conspiracy against the Papal Government, which shrinks, save in the last resort, from the repressive measures required to combat it. Sardinia, like France, has the odious conscription; Sardinia, like France, not only keeps the press in subjection, but under terror of the most cruel oppression. We gave in our last Number some specimens of the Sardinian code. The *Armorica*—the *Piemonte*—and all other Papal journals, were repressed. On the breaking out of the war—the war pretended to be for the 'liberation' of Italy, and to be so popular—renewed measures of repression and coercion were resorted to. The *Piemonte* was punished for publishing an article in defence of the Papal Government with respect to Perugia.

Such is the tyranny of the Sardinian Government that the people of Savoy are vehemently desirous of annexation to France, and the 'movement' is being sternly repressed. Thus we have the following:

"The Sardinian Government continues its severity against the press of Savoy. The *Bon Sens* of Annecy of the 23rd has been seized, the editor having been apparently forced to take out the objectionable matter, as that number arrives with five columns in blank."

We may surely set off the admitted discontent in Savoy

against the alleged discontent in Lombardy and Tuscany. And at all events it proves as much against the Sardinian Government as the movement in Romagna proves against the Papal Government. Supposing that a portion of the Romagnese are discontented with Papal rule, what of it? Is not a large portion of the people of every country equally discontented? What of France? The French Emperor does not venture to allow of a free press. What of England? It does not grant the Charter! If fear of revolution thus besets those powerful governments, why should the Sovereign Pontiff be reproached and reviled because his dominions are not free from it?

We utterly deny and disbelieve that anything like a majority of the Roman people are adverse to the Papal Government. But even if they were, what then? There would be abundant reason for it, quite apart from misgovernment, in that lay jealousy of the clergy which induced the Jewish people to revolt from that Theocracy, which was the type of the temporal rule of the Papacy. The Roman correspondent of the Register put this well.

“Men and weapons have been supplied from Tuscany, and even, I believe, Sardinia,—and so a mere party has been enabled to overthrow the Pope’s government. But the people will begin to find out that the change has not been for the better. Naturally, in thinking over these things, the mind goes back to that other people who would not *have* the Lord God to reign over them, but asked for a king, who should fight their battles for them. I fear that the right of the king they ask for will be much the same now as then. ‘He will take their sons and put them in his chariots, and will make them his horsemen, and he will appoint them to be his tribunes, and centurions, and to plough his field, and to reap his corn, and to make him arms and chariots; and he will take their fields and their vineyards, and their best oliveyards, and give them to his servants, and he will take the tenth of their corn, and of the revenues of their vineyards to give his servants; their servants also, and their goodliest young men he will take away and put to his work; their flocks also he will tithe, and they shall be his servants. And they shall cry out in that day from the face of the king whom they have chosen for themselves.’ It is sad to think how the interests of the many are being sacrificed by the madness of the few, but doubtless the excommunication which the Pope has pronounced upon all who in any way have usurped or disturbed his temporal power, must sooner or later, at God’s good pleasure, have its effect.”

We could not draw this article to a conclusion in better words than those which followed the above.

"Whatever may happen, one thing is certain, that the Holy Father will never consent to give up even the least part of his temporal power. He has declared this not only before the cardinals in Consistory, but also before the whole world, in his encyclical letter of the 18th of June. He is ready to suffer every evil rather than permit his temporal authority to be taken from him. He has cried aloud in his sorrow to the whole Catholic world, and the whole Catholic world must answer him. The time for half-measures has passed away. The course which every Catholic should take is clear. All political differences should be laid aside, all measures of secondary importance for the time forgotten, before the great thought that the Vicar of Christ is in sorrow, and his temporal power in danger. Of what importance are reform, and tenant right, and our own political rights, when those of God's vicar are at stake?"

This is our excuse for the length at which we have treated the subject, and with that excuse we close.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*Realities of Paris Life*. By the Author of *Flemish Interiors*. In three volumes. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1859.

Realities of Paris life. The name of this book is at once an introduction and an invitation. It bids the reader to waive all useless ceremony and to place himself at once upon a familiar footing with the author. For real work has to be done; pleasure is not here the object of pursuit. We shall not be instructed how to pass a few months of agreeable idleness at Paris, how to skim lightly over the surface of its pleasant society, and to bring home with us a superficial knowledge or an antiquated prejudice. We shall not be introduced again into the famous political "salons," where wit and beauty were once wont to throw their lustre upon the most polished society of Europe, and where, in brilliant phrase, the policy of kings and emperors was canvassed and condemned. Into those celebrated mints of fashion, where once were struck the "bons mots," which in their bitter irony were more keen than a two-edged Damascus blade, have so often wounded the



triumphant soldier on the battle-field, the politician in the cabinet, or the king on his throne. This is not the life, not the world we are to visit. There is another life, another world close by, which we take no heed of; a world of passionate hearts, of suffering, of misery, of crime; and of patience; a life of Realities, naked to the bone. Let those who have eyes come and see their fellow-man. In the depth of his degradation do they recognize him? And yet he is strong with a wonderful strength, and has a courage which is almost superhuman. The supernatural motive, like a ray of light, pierces into the darkest dens of human misery, and here, in the lowest regions of society, the stranger in Paris will often find, if he follow the footsteps of our author, religion, like a mole, working under ground. The author of the *Realities of Paris Life* has, like a geologist, broken the crust of the earth, in order to examine with a keen eye the various strata, and has then proceeded in a scientific manner to catalogue and classify the explorations. It would be interesting, step by step, to follow all these discoveries in an unknown region, to travel through all the labyrinths of Paris life, to grow familiar with the Faubourg Souffrant, and to penetrate into the mysteries of the Cité Doré, "the metropolis of misery, nestling in the heart of the native land of luxury." We should see strange sights in the rookeries of Paris, and become acquainted with men of a strange aspect, living, like the chiffonniers, a life peculiar to themselves. We fancy, (although a reviewer ought not to meddle with the busy faculty of imagination,) we have seen in our peregrinations in the twilight, this bold searcher after truth plunge with resolute tread down into the lowest den, or scale with nimble foot the lofty garret, in order to come face to face with the realities of life. We can detect the shrewd penetrating glance we remember so well, and behold again the impatient shrug of the shoulder, or the caustic rebuke bestowed on the impertinent impostor. We can well imagine the not unfrequent application of the favourite "Scotch rappee," to hide or disperse the moisture gathering in the eye from sympathy with the real miseries of life, for beneath the folds of an ample dress is hidden no unkindly heart.

On reperusal of the *Realities of Paris Life* we find we have marked page after page for quotation; from very abundance the task of selection becomes difficult. We

make no doubt, however, our readers will relieve us from the difficulty and satisfy their own curiosity by perusing the work itself. We give, as a specimen of our author's style, the following description.

"No sooner does the Sister enter the ward than gloomy countenances are lighted up, unseemly conversations cease, and even the attitudes assumed are more respectful. If a patient considers himself aggrieved by his medical attendant, whether in being dieted, or compelled to take a disagreeable remedy, one word from the Sister suffices to calm him. His stubborn and indomitable nature, which piques itself on its inflexibility, becomes at once docile and supple at her words, like that of a little child.

"It is easy to imagine the satisfaction and repose of mind experienced by the Sisters at finding themselves in a position where female aptitude and tenderness, skilful manipulation, and devoted hearts combine to soothe their complaints; and on the other hand, the administration must be a gainer by a system whence follows so considerable an economy in all expenses. And yet how little importance they themselves seemed to attach to their labour of love.

"True daughters of the noble but lowly St. Vincent, humbly, hopefully, and prayerfully they went to their responsible and glorious—but to them natural and simple duties; silently, thoughtfully, and noiselessly, they returned to resume them in other spheres. They were not numbered, they were not named: under the coarse grey habit and snowy coruette-uniform with the 13,900* others scattered over the world, to do their Lord's work—none could know which was a peasant, which a peeress, and which a princess. This fact was effectually and intentionally concealed from the curious eye of the world.

"No 'special correspondent' noted their individual, no, nor yet their collective exertions; no newspaper praise recorded their deeds or lauded their endurance; no ovation welcomed their return; no subscriptions were raised on their behalf; no hospitals will be erected in their honours, or named after their names; and no sovereigns invited them to their palaces, or decorated them with ornaments of gold and precious stones. Oh, no! They are too ambitious to be satisfied with such rewards as these; a perishable monument of stone will not suffice to satisfy their upward longings; an immortality which can but endure so long as the human race is too brief for those whose aspirations are directed to the possession of eternal crowns, which may glitter for ever on their brow; for the palace of the King of kings is that to which they seek to be invited—not for the transitory visit of a guest, but to claim their

* In the copy before us the number 139 is given; 13,900 was the author's estimate. It shows great negligence to allow such an error to creep in.

birthright, and to reign with Him as heirs of His glory and His power to all eternity."—Vol. ii. p. 267.

For us the Realities of Paris possess the singular charm of combining the old and the new, the known and the unknown, the strange and the familiar. It speaks to us in the tone of an old friend, and yet it has all the charm of novelty. We fancy we recognize in it a voice we have heard before, and yet it speaks of sights that have escaped our observation, of sounds that our ears have not caught, and of a life in Paris, strong, stirring, and religious, which we have not dreamt of in our English Philosophy. The Realities of Paris Life are novelties to the English reader. To him no ground so new as the ground our author has gone over. No picture to him so strange as the vivid picture here presented of Catholic charity in its various institutions and communities, now struggling in noiseless obscurity with every form of distress, moral and physical, now going out into the street to meet vice, and win with its persuasive voice the reluctant sinner, and now grappling with crime in its death-struggle, and gaining so often the hard-earned triumph of a death-bed repentance. The genius of organization distinguishes in an eminent degree the French character. It was singularly displayed at the outbreak of the Crimean war. And we may now observe, if we choose, the same spirit regulating and giving force to the charitable institutions and to the religious confraternities of Paris. But real charity does not blow its own trumpet. If we wish to discover her divine aspect we must seek after her with something of the avidity we are wont to bestow or squander in Paris, on the pursuit of pleasure, in London, on the search after gold. What know we, indeed, of Paris? Do we know much more than what from time to time we have gleaned from the novel, from "our own correspondent," or from the hasty and superficial traveller? The idea we have of Paris is a conventional idea. The English public is startled and shakes its grave head when it hears for the first time, as in these volumes, of a religious life in Paris. Impossible, it exclaims, Paris is the theatre of Europe, and nothing more. Men go thither for amusement. It is the gay city where the world seeks dissipation after its labours. To keep up this fashionable notion our light and elegant writers deal in stock-phrases, and speak in cant terms of the frivolous city, the sinful city; but when, as we before

have had occasion to remark, an event occurs to make manifest the deeper, the inner life that heaves beneath the surface of society, the lips of these voracious chroniclers of passing events are mute as the grave. Not a word escapes from the lips of these shrewd observers of human nature lest their incautious utterance might reveal to their readers that there were better elements in Paris struggling against its frivolities, its periodical revolutions and its fearful crimes. The workings of the Catholic Church, and its glorious victories in the city of Voltaire, pass unnoticed and remain unknown. Ravignan, the great Jesuit, and Sister Rosalie, were realities in Paris life. Their influence extended far and wide, on high and low; they acted on public opinion and belonged as much and as really to the life of Paris, though of course in a different way, as the Times newspaper does to London, and yet they lived and died, and not a word about their works and wonders were allowed to reach these shores of ours. A regular system of barring out exists. Even the numerous critics who have reviewed this work, either from idleness or ignorance, have passed over in silence the remarkable chapters, though they have all the charm of complete novelty, which treat of the charitable institutions and the various confraternities and the religious communities of Paris. Honesty can now no longer plead ignorance. The author of the *Realities of Paris Life* has cut that ancient but treacherous ground from under its feet. There is no room for doubt. Those who now choose to read these volumes cannot but believe what they read. The author describes the scenes and sights to be sought out and studied with all the graphic minuteness and power of a Dutch painter. Not a feature is too minute to escape notice. Not a word but is fixed in the memory. There is no striving after effect. There is a singleness of purpose to show life as it is, but the effect is often grand from this eloquent simplicity,

“One touch of nature makes mankind akin.”

Life-scenes rise before us in their vivid and palpable reality. We likewise have a reality of our own to add to the *Realities of Paris Life*, as true and as strong as the truest and best, that lives in these eloquent pages—the realities, namely, of our admiration for the spirit that conceived and executed this valuable work.

II.—*Three Letters on the Prophecies, &c.*, by James Hatley Frere, Esq. London: Hatchard and Sons. Reprinted as a Second Edition. 1859.

This worthy gentleman, as it appears, has entered his eighty-first year, and is, as we believe, the father of Sir Bartle Frere, whose signal Indian services may well restrain our remarks on this extraordinary publication. Perhaps the appearance of this second edition may be a sufficient warrant for our drawing attention to the work after the example of our respected contemporary, the "Saturday Review," in the case of the strange essay of a Scotch free-kirker, to prove that we Catholics worship Ninus and Semiramis. For if that farrago of nonsense can find a host of readers and admirers, it is possible that our octogenarian may be equally successful. Indeed, the accommodating character of his system of interpretation does seem entitled to some reasonable acknowledgment, for we find that what he once fitted on to Napoleon the First and his son, was capable, on the extinction of that race, of immediate transfer to "the Infidel Individual Antichrist" for the time being, and has now been found to fit exactly on to Napoleon the Third as "king of Rome." But, alas! for our prophet; scarcely will his ink be dry before he will be compelled to modify his interpretation, as we believe even his credulity will not encourage him to hope that our Holy Father will, for the present at least, resign his throne in favour of the Emperor Napoleon the Third.

III.—*Disertatio de Syrorum Fide et Disciplina in re Eucharistica.* Lovanii, 1859.

We have here, in a compendious form, a book calculated to assist the student in theology, who is willing to make himself acquainted with oriental forms and modes of thought upon ritual matters. Those who are willing often are not able to do so, from the expensiveness of the collections in which such works occur; but the language, in a dialect of which our Lord and our Lady spoke, certainly ought not only to have attractions for the theological student but also to be put within his reach. One is glad to see a writer who makes so orthodox a use of very considerable attainments in Syriac, as the present writer does, and whose Latin translation, if a little at fault here and there, is at least calculated to make the work useful

even to those who know nothing of the original language. The ritual work of John of Zela is now published for the first time. M. Laing's principal object may be to place before theologians the views of Syriac writers upon the Eucharist, but we confess we think that the addition of a small lexicon would have made the work more useful.

During a very considerable period theological terminology has not had much done for it, and he who would subject the Syriac branch of it to examination, would be a useful contributor to the science in general.

IV.—*The Analogy between the Old and New Testament*, by Father Martin Becanus, S.J. Translated by the Very Rev. Dr. Killeen, O.S.A. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

The importance of the study of the Holy Scriptures in countries like our own, and under the circumstances of the present time, can scarcely be overrated. Assailed, as we are on all sides, by pretenders to divinity of every possible hue, from Pusey to Spurgeon, it is most important that the Catholic clergy should provide their flocks with popular and accessible works, that they may be sufficiently armed against all comers, and that there may be no room for the imputation of the discouragement of Biblical studies, under proper direction, and with the usual safeguards, by the Catholic Church. Our own eminent Metropolitan has published in the pages of our Review a valuable paper on the Catholic use of the Scriptures, (which was reprinted by our publishers in a popular form,) and the illustrious Primate of Ireland put forth a most valuable work on this subject shortly before his elevation to the Archbishopric of Armagh. The present work is a translation from the learned Jesuit Father Becanus, a contemporary of the great Cardinal Bellarmine, who died at Vienna some two centuries ago. His theological works have always been highly esteemed, and the present volume is especially suited to the present time. It is dedicated to the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, who regards it as "a valuable addition to the library of every theologian," being recommended also by the Archbishops of Tuam and Cashel, and seven other bishops. The Rev. translator mentions that he has not been slavishly literal in the execution of his task, but has made such modifications and abbreviations as have seemed to be required to promote and secure the usefulness of the work, which we trust will be as well received as it deserves to be.

V.—*Simplicity of the Creation; or the Astronomical Monument of the Blessed Virgin.* A New Theory of the Solar System, Tunderstorms, &c. Dedicated to Her by William Adolph. London: Catholic Publishing Company, 1859.

With the science and philosophy of this publication we do not intend to interfere. As every large quantity of chaff must almost of necessity contain some seed, it is for the public interests that no check should be placed upon any publication which can by possibility contain anything worth knowing. Let, therefore, Mr. Adolph publish his lucubrations and welcome. But we must enter our most solemn protest against his presuming to dedicate them to our Blessed Lady, because through her intercession his wife received a miraculous cure, and to assume the approbation of "the estatica" to his work because she smiled at him "so significantly." God forbid that we should question the propriety of publishing "the wonderful works of God;" but we may reasonably require that any narrative of them should be based on the usual and reasonable authentications suggested by the Church, and should not be exposed to the scorn of the vulgar and ignorant, by such an ill-judged association of incongruous subjects as is presented by our author. He has, moreover, chosen to mix up with his farrago the name of a most respectable priest, to the great annoyance, as we doubt not, of that Rev. Gentleman, and we would gladly learn that he had been enabled to impose upon his penitent a fitting penance for bad taste and presumption. For he is wholly without excuse, as we collect that he has rushed into print in spite of the warning of all the friends whom he consulted. Has he not earned, then, in addition to the title of "Pious" that of an "obstinate Fool?" We regret that his respectable publishers should have lent their names to what we cannot but describe as an outrageous violation of decency.

VI.—*Stereoscopic Portraits of Pius IX., Cardinal Wiseman, and the English Bishops and Dignitaries.* London: Burns and Lambert.

This interesting series progresses towards completion, upwards of twenty bishops and dignitaries (including Drs. Manning and Faber) having already appeared, and the last addition being the portrait of the Bishop of Southwark, which, like many of the others, is published in two sizes, both for the stereoscope and for framing. His Holiness the Pope, and

the prelates of the Pontifical household, are taken in one group, (the Holy Father and his officers having arranged themselves at the Vatican for that purpose); but the other portraits are published separately, and the figures taken in half-length size. Some of them are very striking and life-like, and they are certainly successful on the whole. There are also ecclesiastical groups, representing religious functions, in which several living Catholics will be recognized, and with which an account of the ceremonies illustrated is published.

VII.—*A Catechism of Christian Doctrine*, approved for the use of the Faithful in all the Dioceses of England and Wales. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1859.

The importance of having an uniform edition of the Catholic Catechism for the use of all the English dioceses is too obvious to need remark. The Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster have accordingly caused the editions hitherto in use to be carefully revised; and that which is now put forth by our publishers has the formal approbation of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and all the Bishops of England, who have "prescribed its exclusive use" in their respective dioceses. It is published at the lowest possible prices, in order that the poorest Catholic may be possessed of this small but most important work,—useful at once to the child in the school-room, and to the most learned of our Catholic neophytes. We have noticed that the Catholic Catechism is largely extracted from in several of the Tractarian publications, especially those that are put forth by the "Union," and used by the more advanced sections of the Anglican clergy, a circumstance which probably contributed to the recent outbreak of popular feeling in Dr. Manning's former parish, in consequence of the definite teaching of the rector with regard to the seven sacraments and other points of Catholic doctrine.

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

FEBRUARY, 1860.

- ART. I.—1. *Exploration Scientifique de l'Algérie pendant les années, 1840, 1841, 1842.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale—chez M. Gide et J. Baudry, Paris.
2. *Inscriptions Romaines de l'Algérie.* Par M. Leon Renier. Paris, 1855.
3. *Annuaire de la Société Archéologique de la Province de Constantine.* Année 1854, 1855. Paris: A. Leleux.
4. *The Tricolor on the Atlas, or Algeria and the French Conquest.* From the German of Dr. Wagner, and other sources. By Francis Pulszky, Esq. T. Nelson and Sons, London, Edinburgh, and New York, 1854.
5. *Algeria, or the Topography and History, Political, Social, and Natural, of French Africa.* By John Reynell Morrell. London: N. Cooke, 1854.
6. *Indicateur Général de l'Algérie.* Par Victor Berard Alger. Bastide: Libraire Editeur. 1858.
7. *Algiers in 1857.* By the Rev. E. W. L. Davies. Longman and Co. 1858.
8. *La Kabylie* (and other works), par M. le Général Daumas. Paris: Hachette and Cie.
9. *Sketches of Algeria during the Kabyle War.* By H. M. Walmsley, &c., &c. London: Chapman and Hall. 1858.
10. *Four Months in Algeria.* By the Rev. J. W. Blakesley, &c., &c. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. 1859.

WE blush to admit with what little interest—we had almost said with what unworthy jealousy—the colonization of Algeria by the French is regarded by the bulk

of our countrymen. Should it fail, who knows how soon another Hayradin Barbarossa may arise, and Algiers become once more the seat of a piracy that baffled the genius of Charles V. in the 16th century, and the navies of Spain and Denmark in the 18th; that exacted tribute, subsequently to the age of Nelson, in some form or other, not only from every maritime power in Europe, but from our independent trans-Atlantic brethren:* that, finally, arose Hydra-like, from the bombardment inflicted on it by Lord Exmouth in 1816, with the same pestiferous vitality that it had done previously from that of Duquesne under Louis XIV. In the 17th century, 600 Europeans

* The Americans had made periodical presents to the Dey, besides paying a slight tribute up to 1815. The rest may be classed as follows:

1. Those bound to make presents on every change of Consul, which the Dey took care to demand on the slightest pretext.

	Francs.
Portugal	107,000.
Naples	do.
Tuscany (exempted from tribute in 1816) ...	133,750.
Spain	value undefined.
Sweden and Denmark	do.
England (in virtue of terms concluded by Lord Exmouth after the bombardment) ...	fr. 15,120.

2. Those bound to pay a yearly tribute.

Sweden and Denmark 21,400 fr. (besides a fine of 160,500 fr. every ten years on renewal of treaties).

Portugal	128,400.
Naples	do.

Sardinia, Hanover, and Bremen, paid rather more in presents than England. Russia, Austria, Holland, and France, are said to have enjoyed immunity more or less (at least one treaty, that of 1686, had it been observed, ought to have placed England in the same favoured position), but the Baron adds: "Les puissances, qui ne payent rien, étaient *plus exposées que les autres*, à des mauvaises querelles, qui se raccommodaient avec des cadeaux: c'est ainsi qu'en 1815 l'envoi du consul de France fut accompagné d'un présent de 100,000 frs." Well may he exclaim in conclusion, "On rougit en songeant qu'un nid de pirates a imposé ces insolentes lois à l'Europe pendant plusieurs siècles!"—*L'Algerie par le Baron Baude*. Vol. I. p. 363.

were liberated from a state of slavery by the French Admiral: in the 19th, the whole number of those whom Lord Exmouth sent back to their respective countries, from Tripoli, Tunis, and Algiers, amounted to 3003; and these comprised Italians, Spaniards, Portuguese, Dutch, French, Germans, and English. It was on these shores that the illustrious Cervantes, and the pious Founder of the Sisters of Charity were bought and sold: and it was here that atrocities, which not even the ideal Legree could have surpassed, were perpetrated continually upon free-born Europeans, of whom, in the 17th century, there had been at one time, no less than 35,000,* and among these, no less than 1500 British subjects.† Can anything be more terrific than the picture which the eloquent author of *Don Quixote* has drawn of the barbarities which surrounded him?

“Although hunger and nakedness made us experience dreadful sufferings, they were light compared to those of some of our friends. Our spirits failed in witnessing the unheard-of cruelties that Hassan exercised in his bagnio. Every day were new punishments, accompanied with cries of cursing and vengeance: almost daily a captive was thrown upon the hooks, impaled, or deprived of sight, and that without any other motive, than to gratify the thirst of blood natural to this monster, and which inspired even the executioners with horror.”

He was himself menaced with similar tortures for attempting to escape from his bondage; but the expectation of a large ransom prevailed in his favour.‡

Those days, we may devoutly trust, have at length passed away never to return. France has not only exacted terrible vengeance for the past, but she has done, and is still doing her utmost, with admirable perseverance, to inaugurate a glorious future for those countries which had so long been the strong-hold of ignorance and of crime. Alas! that commercial jealousies and rival interests,

* Morrell's *Algeria*, p. 91.

† See a copy of the Captives' Petition, with their Case, shewing the barbarities practised on them, presented to both Houses of Parliament, under title 816. m. 11. in the British Museum.

49.

‡ Blofield's *Algeria*, p. 296.

should interpose between civilized nations, and retard, or even frustrate results, in the opinion of all impartial philanthropists, the most desirable. All who have visited those Southern shores of the Mediterranean, must admit the immense gain to humanity that has been achieved in the occupation of Algeria by the French. Whatever may have been, or may be still, the faults of their administration, they have at all events put down the Corsair, and made Algeria no less accessible and secure to the stranger, than their own fair country. And yet it took some twenty years to reconcile European Powers, especially England, to their instalment there. Every one, again, that has travelled in Morocco, Tunis, or Tripoli, must admit what a blessing it would be to see those countries governed as Algeria; and yet were Spain or France to take possession of those countries on grounds ever so justifiable, it is not too much to say that, in so doing, they would risk a war with civilized and enlightened England.* What we cannot, or will not do ourselves, we are unwilling to see done by others; and every advance made by our neighbours, we regard with suspicion, as having a tendency, in some

* It is admitted, on all hands, that Spain has had ample grounds for her recent rupture with Morocco, and for commencing hostilities. Yet Lord John Russell, in a despatch to Mr. Buchanan, dated October 15, 1859, after having already demanded and received assurance that Spain would never occupy Tangiers more than temporarily, says: "You will further state to his excellency, that her Majesty's Government earnestly desire that there may be no change of possession on the Moorish coasts of the straits (i. e. as Mr. B. interprets it in his subsequent note to Senor Collantes, 'the occupation by Spain of the coast *west* of Ceuta,' or as Senor C., in his reply, 'any point on the said coast, which would give Spain a superiority, would be dangerous to the navigation of the Straits.')

A curious demand, indeed, to make on one nation going to war with another! Lord John proceeds, "The importance they attach to this object cannot be overlooked, and it would be impossible for them, or indeed any other maritime power, to see with indifference, the permanent occupation by Spain of such a position on that coast as would enable her to impede the passage of the Straits to ships frequenting the Mediterranean for commercial or any other purpose." Gazette of November 8, 1859.—Pretty much the same explanations were asked and given by the English and French governments in 1830, when France commenced attacking Algiers.

way or other, to prejudice our interests. The balance of power in Europe, forsooth! is made a pretext for retaining the Southern and Eastern shores of the Mediterranean in their pristine barbarism. Perhaps England would be better pleased had the Saracens defeated Charles Martel, or had Ferdinand and Isabella never expelled the Moors. Providence, however, bends nations as well as individuals, to a purpose not their own. There can be no question that France originally did not mean anything more than to avenge the insult offered to M. Deval, her Consul, by Hassan Dey; and though she doubtless intended that the vengeance should be proportionate to the outrage, yet could she have foreseen that the consequences of her act would have cost her upwards of £60,000,000 sterling* in a quarter of a century, without any suitable returns, and with the issues of the experiment still doubtful, it is highly probable that she would have contented herself with summary reprisals, and not lavished the blood of her chivalrous troops so profusely upon a field where so little glory was to be won. Gradually and insensibly she was drawn into the position which Providence had assigned her, and from which she could not, with honour, recede. Secondary motives conspired in the same direction.

“Algers was regarded as a place for drilling soldiers for the army; for maintaining its progress, and for punishing the republican troops by sending them against the enemy. The government of Algeria served again for getting rid of the military chiefs, that might have become obnoxious to France?”†

Thus, without for a moment intending to revive the deeds, or embody the ends of the Crusaders, she that gave the first king to Jerusalem in the person of the high-souled Godfrey de Bouillon, has likewise been the first to wrest, and we trust now permanently, from the Mahometan yoke, one of the first of those fair lands which Islamism wrested from Christianity. That Spain may be equally successful, in the prosecution of a war equally just, is our devout wish. This it is which lends additional

* We assume Mr. Blakesley's figures to be correct, but rather under the mark than otherwise.

† Pulszky's Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 387.

interest to the conquest of Algeria by the French, and to which our Indian Empire affords no parallel ; inasmuch as India had never been previously Christian, like northern Africa. Greece alone presents the same spectacle, and thus Greek and Frank appear once more upon the stage together in the same drama, as in the days of Alexis Comnenus, and of Louis IX.

To be sure there is this grand difference between the two periods,—Europe no longer arms in behalf of the Cross. The spirit of the Crusaders has become a thing of the past, alike with their conquests. For the rights of mankind, and for the rights of nations ; for the vindication of compacts or of humanity, for these causes, and for these solely, and yet not even for these rashly and wantonly, will nations involve themselves in a war, the justice whereof can be endorsed by public opinion in the 19th century. Even where conquest, and not merely retaliation or self-defence is the secret or avowed object, it has become a recognized principle that the religion of the minority shall not be interfered with, and that liberty of conscience shall be respected even in the vanquished. Such are the principles which animate the Cabinets of Modern Europe ; it remains to be seen what fruit they will bear, and to what criticisms they will be subjected in a future age. And yet, notwithstanding, these two facts are undeniable : 1. That the Greeks, who have been the first people to emancipate themselves from the Turkish yoke, and to regain their own, were likewise the only conquered nation in the East who remained steadfast to their religion ; and the French, who have been the first to establish themselves in a portion of those fair lands from which Christianity had been driven by force of arms, led the vanguard of the armies of the Cross against the Crescent in the middle ages. But this they have done now, not only not fighting for religion, but with a determination not to trample upon the religion of the usurpers themselves. Under the French government, the religion of Mahomet is not only tolerated, but supported equally with the religion of Christ. Proselytism, in the ordinary sense of the word, is rigorously forbidden. Christian masters and mistresses instruct the Mahometan youth in all that concerns individual and social life, but on the express terms that they are not to tamper with their faith. Churches and mosques, Christian and Mahometan cemeteries are erected and adorned at the

public cost. In short, the principle is asserted, that every religion shall have fair play, and that if Christianity is eventually to become the religion of all, it must be owing to her own inherent vitality; to the superiority of her precepts over those of the Koran, and to the moral and social regeneration which she, far above all other religions, is capable of effecting in the heart of man. Unbelievers will have the spectacle of her excellence brought before them in the lives of her teachers and professors; and their conversion will be their own free spontaneous act, should it ever take place. But we shall have occasion to enlarge upon these topics elsewhere. There are other interests besides those of religion intimately connected with French colonization on the shores of the Mediterranean. In the first place, how beneficial must it prove to the peace of the continent, that the restless, chivalrous, impetuous, spirit of France, should at length have found a field amply extensive for the exuberance of her aspirations, where at least she may gratify her keen thirst for military achievements, without involving her more phlegmatic neighbours in the miseries of war; and where she herself too may be powerfully allured to lay aside the sword for the ploughshare, and exchange political excitement for commercial enterprize. No country is more alive than France to the responsibility of what she believes to be a high mission assigned to her. She has conquered Algeria to vindicate her honour, but she will continue to hold it for the good of mankind. If her own children decline immigrating thither, she holds out security both of life and property to the civilized nations by which she is surrounded, that they may be induced to come and do so. She tells the Bedouin of the desert, that she has not come to rob and oppress him, but on the contrary, to civilize and protect him from others, no less than others from him. And in proportion as she extends, or renders more permanent her dominion there, in the same proportion she must, of necessity, be influenced by it in her relations elsewhere. With a long line of flourishing colonies on the coast of the Mediterranean, she must feel that she cannot lightly adventure a war with her neighbours, especially with maritime powers, for here it is that they will avenge themselves. Toulon and Cherbourg may suffice to protect France herself from invasion, but what will they avail her when Oran and Algiers, Philippeville, and Bona, are threatened, and

when secret engagements are entered into with the native population in their rear? Besides, if these colonies are to prosper, their trade, and that of France through them, must be ever on the increase, to a degree perhaps incredible in the present aspect of things, with all other commercial nations. In the present state of decrepitude of the Turkish empire, it is impossible to calculate upon any great development of commercial activity, beyond what already exists in the far East; and if the sick man's death is to be followed by the wars which have been foretold, who can say how long it may be before commerce will revive, even to the extent to which it is now carried on in those parts? Meanwhile Algeria has got the start; she has already gone through the rough work; she is ploughed for the sowing; any body who feels inclined may set up his farm, and commence operations, in any one of her vast plains, secure not only of the protection, but of the active co-operation of the authorities. Roads have been made—admirable roads to the very confines of the desert. Telegraphs bring Algeria within speaking distance of the mother-country; railways and harbours are in progress; land is readily conceded; wells have been sunk; marshes drained; trees, plants, animals have been acclimated: a vigilant police, European and native (to say nothing of the standing army) organized. All that a strong and intelligent government can do, has been, and will continue to be, done both for the assistance of the colouist in his labours, as well as for his defence against overt violence. If individuals rely too much upon a government that takes so much weight from off their shoulders, the fault is theirs; if that government lays too many restrictions upon individual enterprize, let it at least have praise for the numerous difficulties which it removes from his path. If, in some respects, French colonists sigh for the unshackled freedom and independence in which English colonists are left by their government, there are at least some points in which English colonists would be greatly helped forward in their undertakings by the more powerful, because more concentrated, and more impartially directed, arm of the government. Who can, indeed, prophecy what the future commerce of Algeria will be? "Experiments have sufficiently established the fact that, as regards soil and climate, the coast of Algeria could supply Europe with all the staple articles imported now

from the Southern States of the North American Union.”* Native labour, or “a denser European population,” is the main desideratum. Now that the Kabyles have been thoroughly subdued, however, it remains to be seen whether they can be induced, generally, to work for their conquerors,—as of their hardy industrious qualities there can be no dispute. Besides, it is possible, that, by expanding gradually towards the interior, the French may one day find the means of opening communications between Beled-el-Iereed, and Mabrouk and Timbuctoo, in reference to which a curious native itinerary has been translated and published.† There, that is, in the two latter places, cotton grows in abundance, cultivated by a Negro population. Here, again, are chances of a wide opening for Algerian commerce. How soon may not Algiers become the great Mediterranean emporium of cotton and coffee, cochineal and indigo, tea, and the sugar-cane? Corn, indeed, and tobacco, can be already supplied, in vast quantities, and of the best quality, from her shores. Dates are one of the principal sources of revenue to the government; grapes grow to a size, and in profusion, unknown in Europe; the olive thrives luxuriantly; peach, orange, citron, almond, pomegranate, and banana trees, yield abundantly. Forests there are of oak, and of cedar; mines of iron, lead, copper, zinc, and mercury; marble quarries, and mineral springs, are not wanting. Perhaps the best coral fishery in the Mediterranean is off La-Calle. Every variety of the chase is to be found in the interior. Bright flowers, many-coloured, and sonorous birds, and insects; oriental costumes and physiognomies; a glowing sky, a transparent atmosphere, and, above all, one of the healthiest climates in the world, as is curiously enough demonstrable from antiquity.‡ All this too, within 48 hours of Marseilles, and of France, combine to inspire a general European interest in Algeria, which is felt in common by the merchant, and the man of pleasure, by the Christian philanthropist, and by the

* Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 384.

† *Annuaire de la Province de Constantine*, 1853. p. 92.

‡ Not merely the “*plerosque senectus dissolvit.....Nam morbus haud sæpe quenquam superat,*” of Sallust, but from the longevity marked on the old Roman tombstones.

sportsman. Then, lastly, what antiquarian interest is attached to the Numidia of the old Romans? It was once the granary of their wealth; it is still more fertile than any other country in monuments of their grandeur and indomitable perseverance. There they lie, side by side, with aboriginal, as in our own island with Druidical, remains: only, with us, in shapeless masses, and well nigh effaced; there, in a vast number of instances, almost entire, and in some, even restored. It was the old Roman wall that gave the French artillery so much trouble in the siege of Constantine; it is the gigantic Roman cistern, skilfully repaired by the French, that supplies the modern town of Philippeville with water. It is the boast of the French that they are daily founding new cities, upon sites once inhabited by the lords of the known world, though in so doing, by the way, they have been occasionally betrayed into worse Vandalism than the Vandals themselves. And, by a curious coincidence, the ancient city of Lambesa, with a prætorium abounding in relics of the third legion, was disinterred by the third foreign legion under Colonel Carbuccia.

Reverting to Christian antiquities, what can be more touching than the simple inscription still legible on a rock near Constantine, in honour of a number of poor Christians, whose names are given, who were martyred there, probably A. D. 259, under Valerian? * It is the more affecting, because, in the subsequent persecution under Diocletian, the Bishop of Cirta is said to have played the part of a traitor. So short a time, even in those days, did it take a church to degenerate! †

Then again, at Bona there are not only the remains of the actual cathedral of S. Augustine, but the identical tank or reservoir for rain-water, constructed by order of that renowned prelate, just before the fatal siege of Hippo-commenced. At a small watering-place, not a modern, but a Roman one, near Cherchell, named Tipasa, stands a sweet little church—only wanting a roof to be still available—and with the old cross lying on the ground, on the

* The grounds are stated, *Annuaire de la Province de Constantine*, 1853, p. 79: and also a facsimile of the inscription.

† *Ibid.* No. for 1855, where the inventory of the Church property then given up, is printed at length.

south side of it, in which he may well be supposed to have preached; while the adjacent cemetery may contain the tombs of his auditors, which, when opened, disclose skeletons still in the very posture in which they were consigned to their parent earth. Here are sights to which we may again refer, for the Christian as well as the mere antiquarian. Have we not said enough to inspire interest for a country in so many respects so favoured, in one respect so unique in what it offers? India may present her temples and her idols, but we are unacquainted with their history. Here are living records of a nation whose literature forms our childhood's study, whose spirit we think we have inherited, whose Christianity we embody in our daily life.

Now what has France done since she assumed possession of this favoured territory? how far has she pushed civilization, and upon what principles? what have been her successes, her failures, her experiments? what are her future prospects? It would only be fair to premise this enquiry by a candid enumeration of the difficulties against which she has had to struggle. First, then, it is not a single nationality with which she has been brought into contact, or one that, like the aborigines of America, or of Australia, is likely to die out before the new settlers; or one whose religion was derived from the darkness of ancient heathenism, and had never previously been confronted by the light of the Gospel. Six separate nationalities are comprised between Nemours, on the western, and La-Calle on the eastern coast, between the broad chain of Atlas in the centre, and the Belad-el-Ierid, or Koble of the south; and not one of these can be made to amalgamate thoroughly with their neighbours, or be at peace with their neighbours, or be dealt with in one uniform manner. Of these, of course, the Jew offers the least difficulty; yet such is the contempt which this unfortunate stranger, though naturalized and acclimated people, is held by the votaries of Islam, that their good will brings with it no pledge for the peace of the country, and their kindly treatment is interpreted as a sign of weakness or sordid avarice. The five races which remain are connected, it is true, by the bond of religion, but this, while it unites them as one man against aliens from the faith, is of little service to their conquerors in the settlement of the country, when those conquerors are aliens. In fact it forms a solemn

instinctive compact, always in force, gaining rather than waning in intensity from their progressive advance, for their expulsion at the first favourable opportunity. The Turks, being Mahometans themselves, might amalgamate more or less with Arabs, Moors, Kabyles, or Mozabites indifferently : or without amalgamating they might play one or more against the rest, without having any common tie, and that of the strongest nature, to contend against. Either therefore the French must convert these races, for they cannot adopt their religion ; or else they must force them to emigrate into the wilderness, or beyond the sea, otherwise they will never get over the difficulty. It will be always there, dormant, it may be, for years, but ready to rise up against them upon the shortest notice, and snap asunder the restraints of every other social and more artificial tie. The old Romans could employ Masinissa against Syphax, and Bocchus against Jugurtha ; and religion did not interpose ; against the French, on the other hand, the Mahometans of Tunis and of Morocco might any day make common cause with their co-religionists of Oran, Algiers, and Constantine. Nor is it any small enhancement of the danger, that Islamism and Christianity have been confronted with each other from the first ; and that, in fact, the former commenced in a recoil from the latter. The Koran still opens heaven to the champions of the faith ; Arab and Turk still plume themselves upon the feats of their ancestors, and even now, in some native café you may see a score of white burnouses in breathless attention to the reading of the triumphs of Omar, or the expulsion of Christian dogs from Jerusalem by their great hero Saladin.

Again, each of these five races, as we have before said, have a distinct nationality and require separate treatment. Now the French inaugurated their conquest by a most unfortunate mistake. The Turks of Algeria have the character of being 'proud, frugal, gallant, very honest in commercial dealings, very faithful and reliable as allies, even when they have to fight against Mussulmans. They are less fanatical than all their co-religionists, the Mozabites excepted ; they keep their word strictly, and are often generous.*' Their rapacity, cruelty, and indolence,

* Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 185.

on the other hand, are undeniable. In the heat of the first campaign their expulsion from Algiers was decreed by Marshal Bourmont, and the few that remain only serve to make their loss the more to be regretted. 'The five to six thousand Turks, expelled by Bourmont from Algiers, formed the nucleus of the Dey's army, they alone had kept the country in subjection. Conversant with the character of the Arabs and Kabyles, with the position and mutual relations of the tribes and chiefs, their services would have been most advantageous to the French. By their support and instrumentality the new dominion would have been extended immediately all over the country, and might have replaced the Turkish sway before the tribes became conscious of their power, and before they grew familiar with the idea of an Arab empire. But instead of this the country was thrown into disorganization; the former officials were expelled, and the deeds and rolls of the administration thrown away in the confusion which followed the capture of the Kasbah. The provinces and tribes of the interior were left to shift for themselves, and even the country in the immediate vicinity of the capital was only partially cared for. The natural consequence was, first anarchy, and then an union of the tribes under the supremacy of the mightiest and most fortunate chief.'*

What happened to the Turks by force, has happened to the Moors from circumstances more or less within their own choice. Large numbers of them have emigrated to Tunis and Morocco; and some have incorporated themselves amongst the Arabs, perhaps, after all, only returning to their pristine stock. Still, as Moors, they have never proved any great impediment to the French; their present nature being mild and pacific, with a certain amount of education and refinement. In fact they like the French far better than the Arabs, except so far as religion is concerned. At the same time they remember their expulsion from Spain by the Rummi, a term by which they designate Europeans, and they have shown, by their voluntary abandonment of house and home, that they have deep-seated feelings in spite of their apathy. They have more sympathy for civilization, it is true, than the wild Bedouin, but their numbers are continually decreasing; they have

* Ibid, p. 234.

little taste for the camp, nor indeed would their most friendly dispositions be likely to stand the ordeal of a war in which the interests of religion were involved.

In the Arabs the French have every obstacle to overcome that the annals of mankind could supply. They are a wild race, whose character, stamped in prophecy near four thousand years ago, remains unchanged, except so far as it has undergone a change for the worse, to the present day. 'His hand is against every man, and every man's hand is against him' still; but his ancestors had never been subdued, and his country gave birth to a race of conquerors. From his own shores the Prophet of God issued forth to give true religion to the world; his forefathers wrested Numidia from the infidel, and for one thousand years preserved both their conquests and their independence inviolate. The Turk came originally by invitation, and not by conquest; they respected the viceroy of their Prophet upon earth, and therefore had not refused tribute to the Sultan. But their independence, the administration of their laws and customs, they had never surrendered or allowed to be taken from them in the whole course of their history. Faithful to his traditions, the Arab of Algeria still cleaves to the patriarchal life, abhorring the contamination of large towns, preferring tents to dwellings of a more durable kind, and a roving to a settled existence. Agriculture is the only tie that binds him to the soil; but flocks and herds are more compatible with his native bias. His philanthropy is confined to his own race; he despises every religion but his own; he looks down upon the benefits of civilization, except so far as they can be incorporated into his actual mode of life, or be turned to account in the chase, or in the camp. He is content with his own slovenly mode of tilling the ground. He ranks science with the occult arts. He has no ambition to be more educated than he is. It is enough for him that his marabouts should acquire knowledge for the good of the public. He is naturally indolent, and therefore prefers taking from others when he can, and when he cannot, doing without superfluities, to the securing them by the sweat of his brow. He has no patriotism, because he has no fixed home; no incentive to peace, because he has so little to lose; indifferent to what may happen, because, like all Mahometans, he is a fatalist. In his temperate habits, in his intercourse

with his brethren he may exercise those virtues which travellers are fond of attributing to the Bedouin of the desert; but in his dealings with Europeans, the Arab of Algeria is cunning, thievish, and lying; his frugality seems the effect of indolence rather than of choice; his treachery but ill accords with our prepossessions of his chivalry; his superstitions are more deeply rooted in him than his religion; and his love of independence assumes the effect of impatience of the restraints which govern society. For the first time in his history he has been thoroughly subdued; but will the French likewise succeed in civilizing him, and making him fraternize with aliens from his faith and blood? If not, let them beware how they let him into the secrets of modern warfare, or they may wing the shaft that will one day be sped against themselves. It is not impossible that the Spahis may yet rival our Sepoys.

Of the two races which remain, the Mozabites, and in them we shall include the inhabitants of the desert generally, are a federative republic, inhabiting three oases of the Sahara, and have a much higher character assigned to them. Some trace them to those Gætulians to whom Rome gave citizenship; others are full of their Moabitish origin. Unlike the Arabs, they inhabit fortified cities, and are as industrious as mechanics, as they are as cultivators of the soil. The Arabs themselves eulogize their superior justice and honesty; and their Talebs, or Doctors, preach the pure Koran without fanaticism. They have, in consequence, been described as Mahometan Protestants.* One feature in their republican life is very remarkable. 'There are so few ambitious men among them, longing for office, that it often happens that the elected official flies suddenly away from his city, not to be compelled to accept office; but commonly he is pursued, and constrained to accept the dignity bestowed on him.'† Here perhaps their conquerors might copy from them with advantage. Some hundreds of them are domiciled in Algiers, where they exercise their specialities, and maintain intercourse with their countrymen; and it is of these apparently that M. Berard says, 'That they are the

* Blakesley's *Algeria*, p. 280.

† Tricolor on the *Atlas*, p. 202.

only people that have had the good faith to manifest their admiration for our civilization, and exalt its salutary effects.....'*

We are more disposed to agree with the *Annales Algériennes*, and with General Daumas, in our estimate of the Kabyles or Berbers, than with Dr. Wagner. In his time the habits of this singular people had not been thoroughly explored, and they were attacking and being attacked. It is only very recently that they have been completely brought under French rule.† Their origin is probably a very mixed one. 'They inhabit the whole of the coast-mountains from Morocco to Tripoli, and the languages which they speak vary.' We incline therefore to the opinion which regards them as 'a mixture of the different nations which have settled successively in northern Africa, and repressed by new and warlike invaders, have found in the mountains a home of freedom. The blood of Numidians, Phœnicians, and Vandals, mingled when those people sought successively a refuge in the Atlas, and engendered a new nation.'‡ We have already spoken of the ancient city of Lambesa, as having been disinterred by the French. It is encircled by a branch of the Atlas, called the Auras, and the whole neighbourhood abounds with ruins, and is intersected frequently by the old Roman road. Here, therefore, the empire of the West was powerfully represented; while we gather from monumental inscriptions that most of the legions employed in those parts were recruited from Germany. When Numidia fell into the hands of the Vandals, it is likewise probable that they directed their attacks against the most thriving settlements, and located themselves most extensively in the most fertile spots. Such would be the table-land between Constantine and Lambesa. Now it is precisely in these regions of the mountain range, that the Kabyle is fair-haired, and of light complexion, and what is still more remarkable, exhibits a small cross tattooed on his forehead—a badge still common to some Oriental Christians: and in use, likewise, amongst the women of some of the Kabyle tribes

* *Indicateur general de l'Algerie.* Alger, 1858.

† For the last war the Sketches of Col. Walmsley, himself an eye-witness, are most interesting.

‡ Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 161.

in other parts. Further, throughout Kabylia, the female sex enjoys a liberty, and is treated with a respect that contrast strangely with their condition in a Turkish or Arab ménage. Kabyle legislation again is in accordance with their mixed origin. They have, besides the Koran, a code which ancient tradition has handed down to them, and in which certain offences have certain pecuniary fines attached to them; but murder does not figure in the category. Authority will not interpose between the avenger of blood and the manslayer, and bloodshed is irredeemable. They have likewise statutes, which they call Kanoûns; another vestige of their Christianity, says General Daumas,* for it is only the word 'canons' Kabyalized. But it will not do to linger over these interesting characteristics. The remark of the French soldiers in fighting with the Kabyles was, that they did not, like the Arabs, fight and run away, but where they stood, there they fell. They had a country to die for, like the Swiss or Tyrolese. Thoroughly republican in their organization, they are even more jealous of their individual independence. It is not enough for them that their tribe should be upon absolute equality with all other tribes, if they themselves are not likewise upon absolute equality with their brethren. Enta cheikh, una cheikh, or, 'you chief, I chief,' was the retort of a peasant to the 'amim,' or magistrate of his village. In marvellous illustration of their proud spirit of independence, they bring their 'yakka' and 'achour,' or taxes prescribed by the Koran, not to their authorities, but to the mosques, as to God alone: with no less high-souled regard for the dignity of the individual, they look on the bastinado, which the degenerate Arab still prefers to a fine, as the last of degradations that can be inflicted upon man. As regards their general character, none have disputed their industry, or even a certain amount of proficiency in the arts. Their gunpowder is so well manufactured as to be mistaken for English; their counterfeit money—though this trade is not in repute—has been maintained to be genuine, by a banker of Algiers, already apprized of its spuriousness.† They are good miners, and good tanners; they make excellent pottery, and can forge both the sword and the

* *La Kabylie par le General E. Daumas*, p. 52, also p. 20.

† *La Kabylie*, p. 48.

sickle. They weave superior carpets and burnouses. One who seems to have visited their country says that he could never understand the story of the Forty Thieves quite, till he had seen the jars in which their oil is stowed away, of a size well capable of containing full grown men, armed and fully equipped.* Arab hospitality has been much extolled, and we maintain, exaggerated, at least in Algeria, and that of the Kabyle depreciated, because unknown. But to be safe in a single tribe amongst Arabs, you must have your 'aman,' or passport, from some one in authority; neither does his protection avail beyond his tribe. The 'anaye,' or Kabyle passport, on the other hand, can be obtained by the stranger from the first and meanest Kabyle with whom he has made friends, and it is respected in the village of him who gives it: but let the token, which it always is, have been given by one of their Marabouts, and it is omnipotent throughout Kabylia, and even shields the offender from vengeance. The last of their institutions which we shall notice is one in which General Daumas thinks he sees further evidence of their former Christianity, namely, their 'zaouia,' or religious university.† It is here that indiscriminate hospitality is exercised, and both the stranger and the poor are cared for; that children have religion and secular acquirements instilled into them; and literary men (tolbas) perfect their studies. A mosque built over the tomb of some Marabout is indispensable to the establishment; and hither the faithful repair from all parts,—as to the shrine of S. Francis, at Assisi, or of S. Dominic, at Bologna,—to make, and supplicate for the performance of their vows. It is supported by voluntary contributions, as well as a share of the taxes. The Marabouts themselves are its directors. Their lives, it has been remarked, would compare with our accounts of the ascetics of the Thebaid. Considered as a public establishment, the 'zaouia' is at once a religious university, and a gratuitous 'auberge,' says the same author, 'in striking analogy with the mediæval monastery. Considered as a political institution, it is the centre from which every influence shoots forth, and from

* Algiers in 1857, by Rev. E. W. L. Davies, p. 110.

† p. 26.

which the word of order throughout Kabylia is derived.* But how are the French to establish relations with these mountaineers, who live so completely to themselves in their inaccessible fastnesses? They have a curious custom of facilitating intercourse with the rest of the world, and no less striking in its originality. One of every Kabyle family is obliged for a time to seek his fortune in one of the principal towns of the country, till he can return home with a competency. Hence their numbers in Oran, Algiers, Setif, Constantine, and Bona.

The whole Kabyle population is estimated at 850,000: that of the scattered sons of the desert may be a trifle more: while the Arabs are said to be as numerous as the populations of Kabylia and Sahara united: Moors not above 100,000: Turks, with their descendants, the Kuruglis, only 6,000: Jews, 19,000: Negroes, lastly from the interior, all virtually slaves, but always commended for their integrity, 3,000.† From the foregoing sketch it would appear that Turks and Moors will soon cease to exist in Algeria; that it is with the races of the Sahara and of Kabylia that the French may be expected to make most progress, and that it is in the Arab population that their main difficulty will ever consist. Could they succeed in making the Mozabite and the Kabyle their friends, could they find means of encouraging immigration from the interior to any great extent by the Negroes; could they contrive that the European population should increase in Algeria with the same rapid strides that it does in the United States, Canada, or Australia, they might then be content to keep down the Arab by force, or banish him gradually back to his native wilderness, with his flocks and herds, and abandon his regeneration as hopeless. We think that they have already concentrated far too much of their labours upon his irreclaimable nature, to the exclusion of some that are much more natives of the soil, less hostile in their antecedents, and more hopeful in their present attitude. But how shall we characterize those difficulties which the French have created for themselves all the world over—and not merely in their north-African colonies—by their insatiate love of revolutions, and their

* p. 22.† *Indicateur General de l'Algerie*, p. 35.

political inconsistencies, vague and variable as the wind? During the short time that they have held Algeria they have dethroned their hereditary king, and exiled their constitutional king; they have abolished monarchy and proclaimed a republic; they have quarreled with their republic, and substituted for it, in a time of peace, a despotism unparalleled in their history by universal suffrage! Those champions of liberty that made Europe, that made the universe resound with their advocacy, with the clang of their arms in its behalf, have cast it from them as a polluted thing, and of their own accord have accepted a yoke that gags them, and fetters them, and treats them as maniacs that require restraint, and extorts money from them to array their keepers in purple and fine linen, the better to overawe them. Is this the lesson that is to be imparted to the wild Arab, to the republican Kabyle and Mozabite, a people that prize freedom even more than those boundless mountains and deserts in which they live, and whose independence even the autocrats of Constantinople respected? What will be the value which these nations will set upon the blessings of civilization, when they see so much fickleness, and reckless action, and mockery of the sacred ordinance of liberty, in a people at the head of civilization? The crafty Arab detects at a glance the true state of the case; he venerates realities that are too high for him; he sees through and abhors a sham. He loathes despotism in every shape, whether it be the savage form upheld by the Turk, or the meretricious Parisian ideal saturated with pomade! No people can succeed in re-organizing another country upon stable foundations that are continually changing themselves. If the results of the Crimean war were, happily, to make the French feel how seriously foreign wars interfere with the progress of colonization, they may assuredly gather from events that require no further discussion, how much more seriously its permanence is liable to be endangered by domestic instability.

Do we assert, therefore, that the French have done nothing, or that they have failed in all that they have done, in Algeria? On the contrary, we say that they have done marvels, far beyond what any other nation in their circumstances would have attempted. Their difficulties have been immense, but they have looked them full in the face, and then grappled with them as became

men. They have lavished lives, they have lavished money, they have lavished labour untold, upon the civilization and well-being of their new possessions. All that colonists usually have to do for themselves has been done to their hand by the government. The country has been thrown open to them, in some of the most important respects, ready made. Indeed, with the exception of ports and railways, there scarce remains anything more for the government to do, unless it be to retain and develop what has already been done. Further interference on their part would be more of a hindrance than a boon. All that is really wanting is to remove every restriction upon independent action, and let individuals have every possible liberty, with the least possible intrusive surveillance, to mature their own schemes, and set themselves to work in the way which they judge to be most advantageous and most in accordance with their means and capacities. It will be quite enough for the government to see that the principles which it has laid down shall be impartially carried out, and that its own officials and underlings shall not mar the good work by any conduct unbecoming their station, or any intermeddling with individuals beyond what the laws absolutely necessitate. There is abundant cause for redoubled vigilance in these respects, as we shall see.

As regards religion we have already stated the general principle laid down by the government, to be that of non-interference, and strictly guaranteed, and impartially enforced, toleration. Nevertheless, in many respects even this principle has been overstrained. The French are a highly cultivated people, far beyond what the old Romans were, and they have never determined, and perhaps never will determine, the exact amount of their obligations to the religion which they profess for their present enlightenment. Their very profession of it, however, is a tacit recognition of its excellence, and before they go so far as to encourage, and not merely tolerate, any other religion in their dominions, they should be prepared to say whether they would exchange the civilization attendant upon any such religion for their own. How can it be consistent to despise the barbarism and ignorance of the Turks and Arabs, and in the same breath magnify the excellence of their religion? a religion which has so largely entered into their daily life for so many centuries, without either advancing their intelligence or counteracting their savage

nature. Toleration is surely possible without encouragement; and it is surely possible to do justice to the merits of the Koran without glossing over its errors, or dissembling its palpable inferiority to a religion whose more perfect results are self-evident. According to the views of the French writers of our own days, Mahometanism has been grossly misrepresented, and till of late but imperfectly known. The poor camel driver of Mecca is at length beginning to have justice done to his memory. Friends and foes have come to the conclusion that he deserves to be called a civilizer; that his code was a great advance on the polytheism and idolatry which it supplanted; that it introduced many social improvements; that there is a grandeur about it in its purely religious aspect that is incontestable, and finally, that after the lapse of thirteen centuries it is not possible to find one of its votaries lukewarm in his allegiance.* As if the Koran had not claimed to supplant, and had supplanted, Christianity as well as heathenism; as if, in some of its enactments, it did not pander to the strongest passions that are in man; and as if it was not now, as from the first, identified with the most bloodthirsty precepts ever promulgated under the guise of religion. "The sword," says Mahomet, "is the key to heaven and hell; one drop of blood spilt for the cause of Allah, one night passed watching under arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting and prayer. Whosoever dies in battle his sins are forgiven."† Is it candid, is it wise, to dissemble these facts? Former writers may have dwelt upon them too exclusively, but it will never do to try to write up Islamism by omitting them. Such, however, has been the fashion with French writers for some time past; and what is still worse, it has been endorsed by a succession of overt acts on the part of the government. "Assuredly,"† says Count de Montalembert, in his famous article upon British India, "we shall not meet with any state paper, penned by an English functionary, professing an equal amount of sympathy and

* *Ouvrage inédit de M. le General Daumas, quoted in the Almanach de l'Algerie for 1857, pp. 149-164.*

† *Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 128.*

‡ See the *Times* for Friday, Nov. 12, 1858, where this passage occurs in the translation.

protection for Mahomedan worship, as the speech of M. Latour-Mézerey, Prefect of Algiers, in 1857, to the Muftis and Ulemas, in which he quoted the Koran with unction, in order to exalt the munificence of the emperor towards Islam. I do not remember having seen a single word of criticism on this speech in those French newspapers which are the most prodigal in invective against the pretended complicity of the Anglo-Indians with the worship of Juggernaut."..... We might ask in the same spirit whether the idea of a mosque in Paris for Mahometans could have been borrowed from any similar edifice erected by our government in the city of London for Brahmins or for Buddhists? To build and repair mosques in Algeria, to pay native Muftis and Ulemas out of the public funds, to have Mahometan children instructed in the Koran, and to interdict their teacher from unsettling them in their faith—all this belongs to a government whose principle is universal toleration. Nor shall we dispute but that Islamism merits a higher level than those forms of heathenism above mentioned. But is it therefore to be unduly exalted? and ought governments professing Christianity to shrink from avowing their deliberate conviction of the greater perfections and more civilizing influences of the religion which they profess, even while they force nobody to come over to it against his conscience? Indifference to their religion, it has been truly remarked, is rare even in this, the thirteenth century of their existence, amongst Mahometans. The writer might have added,* that nothing perplexes them more than to see Christians indifferent to theirs. It is a point upon which all travelers are unanimous. "Sometimes," says Dr. Wagner, speaking of some Arab chiefs with whom he had made acquaintance, "sometimes they entered into a disputation about Christianity and Islamism, and they seemed to like my defending my faith with warmth, since with the Arabs the religious indifference of the French is an inexplicable riddle, and is productive of much astonishment and disgust."† The antithesis between French practice and the Koran is singular enough. Mahomet considered that religion was too sublime for the nature of women; from

* General Daumas, see above.

† Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 173.

French practice one would be led to conclude that the nature of man was too sublime for religion. In Mahometan countries women are barely admitted to the mosques on sufferance; in French Algeria the churches seem exclusively for the women, and few men that are not priests or ecclesiastics of some kind ever frequent them. Those, indeed, who absent themselves the most habitually, and who seem to plume themselves the most in so doing, are the civil and military authorities, high and low, perhaps the last still more than the first. They seem to take special pains to make known to the Arab population in what contempt they hold their religion, and how far beneath their dignity it would be to practise it. They take care that they shall never be suspected of saying a prayer even in private. Unfortunately this contempt which they exhibit for religion either recoils upon themselves—for the Arab is persuaded that there is a God above—or else, if he can believe them sincere, when he hears them eulogise his faith, commend his superior morality, speak of his Prophet as a great man, he is possessed with the idea that Frenchmen are dissatisfied with their religion, and will, before long, embrace Mahometanism. There are really few Arabs in Algeria that are not under the latter impression more or less; and truly when they see civilization accompanied by so much immorality and intemperance, by so much infidelity and scorn of religion, as is displayed by their conquerors, it is impossible that they should not believe one of two things—either that civilization and religious indifference go hand in hand, in which case every Arab would pray devoutly to be quit of the bargain—or else that the French people, to be as moral and religious as they are civilized, must exchange the Gospel of Christ for the Koran.

For the advancement of education and literature we do not exaggerate when we say that the French deserve unmixed praise. By education we mean that of the natives; and by literature that of the country past and present. By a decree bearing date July 14, 1850, French-Arab schools were established at Oran, Tlemcen, Mostaganem, Algiers, Blida, Constantine, and Bona. Their number has been increased since. They are entirely gratuitous, and are divided into two separate departments, one for boys and one for girls. Both sexes are taught reading and writing in the French and Arabic languages;

the boys learn, in addition, arithmetic, history, geography, drawing, and music; while the girls have lessons in sewing and embroidery. Private seminaries have been opened for the same laudable ends, and some of them with aid from the government. That of Mme. Luce, for instance, in the heart of Algiers, is assisted by a grant of 3,000 francs annually from the treasury, and numbers no less than 150 young Moorish ladies of the upper classes. Another has been opened by Mine. Chevalier. A third for Jewesses by M. Cohan-Solah. Native children likewise frequent the schools of the different religious orders; but here, as elsewhere, the bounds of secular instruction are not allowed to be infringed. Lastly, the government has founded a superior school for the education of Ulemas, or jurisconsults, exclusively, as well as a college for Arabs. The superiority of these institutions over the old native schools—many of which exist still, and are worth visiting for their originality—is beginning to be felt and appreciated. But they have yet to win their way amongst the masses. Most of the boys who attend them belong to the higher classes, and we should say of the Moors rather than the Arabs, officials of the latter race excepted; still, even so, the experiment has been made upon the most influential part of the community, and the difference between a Kaid that can neither read nor write in his own tongue, and his sons who can read and write, both in French and Arabic, will come out strongly in the next generation. Add to which that the Arab youths will have contracted friendships with the sons of their conquerors—for French boys attend the same schools—and have acquired a taste for their habits, which they will retain through life. And so there is every hope of a reciprocal improvement of feeling on both sides. Female education is attended with more difficulty, on account of the great unwillingness of the Mahometans to trust their daughters from home; and it is a remarkable fact, that while the boys attending the French-Arab schools come from the higher ranks, the girls are usually a base-born offspring. Perhaps, too, there is a reluctance on the part of the Arab to see women elevated in the social scale. Mme. Luce, however, seems to have broken the ice with some of the upper classes, and we may hope that their example will be contagious. Meanwhile no such difficulty will be experienced amongst the Kabyle population; nor

would the inhabitants of Kabylia be more likely to undervalue the benefits of education than the Moor or Bedouin. We trust, therefore, that the French will neither confine their education to the higher ranks among the latter, nor yet to the latter people. The very Negro may well be admitted to his share in the common boon. The separation of secular from religious instruction has been looked upon in this country with jealousy, but it has been universally recognized in the East. Most of the Christian schools at Jerusalem and Damascus, in Asia Minor, and throughout Greece, are of a mixed nature. Greeks and Armenians send their children to the schools of the Latin Convents for instruction in secular knowledge, while religion is taught them exclusively by their own priests. Nobody, whether in Algeria or Syria, objects to the character of the education thus given and received. On the contrary, the principle acts beneficially upon the schools themselves, in the way of incentive to activity and constant amelioration of their respective systems. Throughout the East the Catholic or Latin convents are reputed to have the best schools, but it is competition that has made them so; and it is their exclusively secular character that has enabled them to compete with their neighbours. Many of these schools are numerous attended, and yet cannot boast of a single Catholic boy or girl amongst their pupils; consequently did religion form part of their instruction, they would simply cease to exist, for Greeks, Kopts, and Armenians would never allow their children to be taught what they deem heterodoxy. But then it is to be observed that these eastern schools are not state schools in any sense, and that if religion is not overtly taught, still nothing like irreligion is even indirectly countenanced. It is known that their teachers are either ministers of, or thorough believers in, a definite creed, though not necessarily that of their pupils; and this circumstance assists greatly to counterbalance the otherwise secular tone of the school in the minds of the young, to make them reverence their teacher as being a religious man, and his religion as being that of their teacher. Even in Algeria the pure state-schoolmaster is a "*rara avis*," the Christian Brothers and the Sisters of Charity conducting the majority of the government schools there, as in France, and having even more respect paid them by the Arabs than in their mother country. When the Sisters of Charity first arrived there,

we are told that the natives flocked to gaze upon them from all quarters. They had long heard of their devotedness to the sick and poor, and they welcomed them as angels descended from heaven!

But how have the French been able to found schools for the instruction of the natives in their own vernacular? The truth is that the French have become great Arabic scholars themselves. Nothing can be more praiseworthy than the zeal with which they have applied themselves to the study of the language and literature—such as it is indeed! of a people whom they have conquered. Assuredly Cambrians cannot say the same of the English! In each of the metropolitan towns of Oran, Algiers, and Constantine, there is a Professor of Arabic, and gratuitous lectures are given for the benefit of the more advanced students. By a decree of December 4, 1849, again, a prize is annually offered to all employés in the civil service for the best examination in that language. Officers in the army were allured to it by appointments in the Bureau Arabe, where proficiency was indispensable. Nor have these overtures on the part of government been ill-responded to, or unprolific. French-Arabic grammars, dictionaries, familiar dialogues, easy lessons, vocabularies, have made Arabic as acceptable to the beginner as Latin or Greek, French or English. In short few languages have ever been made more easy. The Arab boy probably learns his own tongue from his French preceptor far more grammatically and correctly than he could do under native instruction. Nor have the French confined themselves to the practical study of the mere language; they have ransacked Arabic literature, and are daily giving the results of their researches to the world. Baron de Slane, for instance, has translated a history of the Berbers, by Ibn-Khaldoun; M. Noel des Verges a history of Africa and of Sicily under Mahometan rule, by the same author. M. Defrénery, the *Travels of Ibn Batoutah*; and M. Cherbonneau, the learned Professor of Arabic in the city of Constantine, a history of the Conquest of Spain by the Moors, from the chronicle of Ibn-el-Kouthya. M. Cherbonneau stands foremost among those who have dug up and brought to light hidden treasure. His paper upon Arab literature in the Soudan is the first notice that we have seen of any intellectual movement, past or present,

among the blacks.* One of our countrymen, Mr. Davies, has made the ruins of Carthage his permanent abode, and is constantly sending home Punic inscriptions to be decyphered by the learned. Among the ancient inscriptions in the *Archæological Journal* of the province of Constantine, we find not only Punic, but specimens of the Phœnician, Libyan, Numidian, and Berber characters. When their nature has been sufficiently explored, it is possible that some interesting facts may be brought out respecting that much calumniated people, the Carthaginians. Another spirited archæologist is M. Renier. Under his auspices upwards of 6,000 Roman inscriptions have been copied and published by the French government; while engravings of the monuments themselves may be seen in the magnificent work entitled "*Exploration Scientifique de l'Algerie pendant les années, 1840-2,*" a noble addition to the records of primitive Christianity and classical art. Since these publications many more interesting remains have been disinterred; and though the museums of Algiers and of Cherchell will probably never rival the Museo Borbonico, still they would afford very valuable information, should any one feel inclined to re-write the history of Numidia and Africa Propria, from the fragmentary notices and evidences that have been exhumed. One circumstance alone would facilitate the labours of any future historian, namely, that the sites of so many towns, long since forgotten, have been recovered. Madaurus, the country of Apuleius, Thagaste, the birth-place of St. Augustine, Milevum, the see of St. Optatus, Icosium, Calama, Russicada, Setifis Colonia, are no longer names without localities. It is possible that the gigantic Kober-Roumia,† a monument only surpassed by

* Pp. 1-48 of the *Journal* of the A. S. of the province of Constantine.

† See *Indicateur General de l'Algerie*, p. 88, the most accurate and most recent account, for Mr. Blakesley's is greatly below par. Its outer architecture doubtless belongs to a later period, probably of the same date as the ruined village of Tipasa, from whose quarries the stone was evidently hewn. By the Arabs it is called "Tomb of the Christian Lady." Some say of Cava, daughter of Count Julian, the ally of the Moors. (See the *Tricolor* on the Atlas, p. 67.) Or the tomb of Cecilia Metella may have suggested it. At all

the pyramids of Egypt, may have been the mausoleum mentioned by Pomponius Mela, between Iol (Cherchell) and Icosium, (Algiers), of the ancient kings of Mauritania; and that its pendant near Batna, the Madr'asen, may contain the ashes of Syphax, of the kings of Numidia, or, as M. Cherbonneau suggests,* of king Aradion. At all events ancient architecture has left few specimens that are more imposing. Some of these localities, Calama for instance,† may have suffered from the exigencies of the French soldiery; but it is equally certain that most of these antiquarian discoveries have been made, and the inscriptions copied, in the first instance, by French officers. Archæologists again would have been more pleased, and we think commercial and even sanitary ends generally better answered, had the French avoided building upon old sites, and thought more of railways, harbours, roads, commerce, health, when they laid out their new towns. Military occupation evidently has been the thing uppermost in their minds, and it is only wonderful that with these views they should have done so much to benefit literature, and so little of which her most ardent enthusiasts can, with justice, complain.

Equally true is it that in the administration of justice in Algeria, so far as the inhabitants are concerned, the French have exercised great wisdom and moderation. All offences against French law are carried into French courts, but the Arabs have native courts in which offences against their own law are tried; and judgment is pronounced by the Kadi, or magistrate, who receives a salary from government. From his sentence a court of appeal has been established, called Medjeles. In short, the native code has been left intact for all purposes of litigation

events the Roman cement, and vestiges of a Roman inscription by the door on the north, incontestably prove the hand of the Romans in it.

* But the *engaged* columns, Tuscan capitals, and laying of the stones, (all lengthways) bespeak a more remote antiquity. Besides there are traces of characters that look like Numidian on the north and south sides. See the journal (*Annuaire*) before quoted, p. 180; comp. pp. 108-119.

† Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 91. Mr. Blakesley, p. 230, is far too sweeping in his censures.

between natives themselves, where it does not contravene French law. Even the use of the bastinado has been tolerated in compliance with the wishes of a people who are insensible to the disgrace of corporal punishments, but are loth to be fined or imprisoned.

In the same way government continues to be administered to them through the accustomed channels, though in the Sheikh, Kaid, and Agha, the French profess to see the exact counterpart of their mayor, sub-prefect, and prefect. These native chiefs exercise lordship over their respective tribes, and collect taxes, and execute ordinances, for the French government. Hitherto the government of Algeria has been centred in the Governor-General, assisted by a council. His authority extended over the three provinces of Oran, Algiers, and Constantine, and his decrees, when confirmed by the Minister of War in the mother country, passed into laws. Each of the three provinces contained within it a department presided over by civil, and a division presided over by military authorities. In reality, however, it was the military element, or generals of division, that exerted the greatest sway with the fewest checks, and it was the incessant petition of the colonist to have his village placed under civil jurisdiction. It was to the military authorities likewise that the native chiefs before mentioned were for by far the most part subject. The government addressed the Agha through the generals of division and their subalterns; and the Agha, with the assistance of his Kaid and Sheiks, collected the revenue and enforced order in his district. Latterly, indeed, a special board, called the Bureau Arabe, was instituted to be the medium of communication; but then it was still under the direction of French officers, though administered through native agency. Travellers have with one accord testified their grateful acknowledgments to the Bureau Arabe, and with good reason. Its interpreters were always ready to oblige, and to give reliable information; and its letters were more valuable than a Foreign Office passport by far, as they ensured hospitality as well as respect and security. Like every institution it had its abuses notwithstanding—it had become the hot-bed of corrupt practices, and the Tlemcen tragedy caused rigid enquiries to be made, which have resulted in the suppression of what promised to be, and in fact was in many respects, a most valuable establishment.

Doubtless the same thing will be restored under another form. But the truth is, the whole administration of the country is being so thoroughly remodelled, that to dwell more upon the government, even as it existed but a year since, would be to speak of a thing of the past, and to criticize what has been abandoned. If the following words of M. G  ry, the new Prefect of Algiers, are not exaggerations, some of our criticisms will have been already fore-stalled.

"People of Algiers. Algeria has ceased to be a colony. Under the generous impulse of His Imperial Highness Prince Napoleon, a new organization has assimilated the departments of Algeria to those of the mother country; has imparted, by conferring on them independence, greater energy to the local authorities, has preserved as a safe-guard an army commanded by one of the most illustrious generals of the empire; has left full liberty to individual initiative, and opened the way to many important improvements."*...The French are fond of "assimilation." When we dine with a Frenchman "en famille," we see children who have not entered their teens sitting down to a six o'clock dinner in the midst of a company of grown up people, eating of every variety of rich dish that is handed round, and behaving with a mannerism, and giving lively vent to a conversation that is far beyond their years. Upon the same principle we suppose it is that Algeria—a babe in arms—is to be "assimilated" to the mother country. "Algeria has ceased to be a colony." It is startling to be told that it has ceased to be what in fact it had scarce ever been. Had the announcement been that it had begun to be a colony, it would have been more consistent, and we must add, more pregnant with hope. We are now about to enter upon this branch of the subject, namely, the attitude of the government towards colonization and colonists, and it will be by no means the bright side of the picture, we fear.

In the first place, the French committed a great error against themselves, when they took possession of the country, through ignorance of the laws of Turkish sove-

* See the Times of Nov. 24, 1858, under the head of Algeria. Prince Napoleon, however, has long since resigned his office. Has this programme therefore become a dead letter?

reignty. The inhabitants were mere occupants of the soil, without any more permanent title than the will and pleasure of their liege lord, the Sultan or his vicegerents. It would have been consistent with justice had the French government resumed the whole territory, and only granted it back permanently to the inhabitants on condition of some yearly acknowledgment, however small, or a fixed price once for all. But the French were full of their European ideas, and only took possession of those lands that were unoccupied and unclaimed, and those which had formed the domains of the Deys. It is still doubtful whether all have been recovered that came under the last category, for when the Turks were expelled the traditions of the old administration went with them. The consequence was, that, in familiar parlance, the French were *done* by the Arabs to a very considerable extent. Again, it was for a long time undecided what the French would do with their new possessions. From 1830 to 1840 it was a mere military occupation, and nothing more. Eight different generals succeeded each other in the command of the army and of the country, campaign followed upon campaign, and was there a short respite for internal organization, a fresh Governor-General stepped in to reverse the system of his predecessor. With Marshal Bugeaud things began to assume a more settled aspect. He held office from the commencement of 1841 to the summer of 1847, and his name will be long remembered in Algeria both for his military achievements and for the energy which he devoted to systematic improvements. Still the summit of his aspirations seems to have been bounded by the circumstances of the moment. He saw difficulties on all sides, and thought that the only plan which promised success was one which had been originated in old time by a general of his own stamp and fortunes, and had been found to answer, in other words, a military colony, such as Sylla founded for the reward of his veterans, and which the Cæsars continued. Meanwhile the power of Abd-el-Kader had to be crushed, and Marshal Bugeaud had been supplanted by the Duc d'Aumale before the country was assured to the French by the capture of the only man capable of organizing any resistance to their dominion. Whatever good Marshal Bugeaud achieved was nipped in the bud by the troubles which ensued in France. Once more the office of Governor-General was bandied about

from hand to hand, and the Arabs took advantage of the general confusion to multiply revolts. Marshal Randon has been a second Bugeaud since 1851. Colonization has advanced under his auspices more than it had ever done before, but war with Russia, wars with the Arab and with the Kabyle, have interfered greatly with the progress of his administration. Then the pacification of Kabylia has been followed by his recall. Still it is only from 1850 that Algeria began to be in any just sense of the word a colony. In a colonial point of view, therefore, let the question be asked, What have been the deeds of the government up to, and more particularly since, that time?

First and foremost in our enquiry we are bound to notice those gigantic works of peace, accomplished, in the intervals of their campaigns, by the victorious army, and which have crowned them with laurels more exuberant, and glory far more appreciable, than any that could have been won from the wild Bedouin. The French army is radically of a different make from the English. It is the fruit of conscription, and contains within it a complete town. All trades and crafts are found in it, from the simple peasant to the tailor and shoemaker, and from the raw mason and carpenter to the more scientific mechanic. Hence it can, and does, bend itself to the arts of peace with a pliancy that is only surpassed by its 'elan' against the foe. And it is to the credit of the soldiers, no less than of their commanders, that this their admirable versatility has not been allowed to lie dormant. 'Altogether,' says Dr. Wagner, 'the employment of soldiers in the construction of works of public utility, is one of the most laudable results of the occupation of Algeria.....' A splendid example is given in the same page of the same author. 'Mers-el-Kebir is the harbour of Oran, but, unfortunately, two French leagues distant from that city.....' The French set actively to work, and blasted a road through the cliffs, in order to secure an access from the town to the harbour. In several places the tertiary lime cliff, rising to 80 feet, was to be demolished; in another place a tunnel had to be bored through the rocks; and such was the hardness of the material that it cost one year of incessant labour to perforate the cliff for 200 feet. This road, and all the others in the Regency, were like the drainage of the plain

of Metija, and of that of Bona, made by the army.* We well know what the salutary effects have been of the draining of those boundless plains; and what countless difficulties will require to be surmounted for the completion of the operation. But the road from Blidah to Medenah—the passage of the gorges of the Chiffa—is a triumph over nature that would compare with the Simplon or the Splugen. For miles it is carried, like the foregoing one, through the solid limestone that defied every other agency but that of gunpowder, and then yielded most unwillingly till the required space had been obtained. Hence it is, that except at the angles—which, however, are of very frequent recurrence—it is a complete zig-zag the whole way. It is seldom broad enough for two vehicles to pass, while so pointed and so abrupt are the angles themselves, that in rounding them the long and unwieldy diligence seems often to be steering directly over the precipice beneath. But if the excessive hardness of the rock presented a general difficulty on the one hand, the exceptional difficulty, arising from the friable nature of the soil in certain places, was even greater on the other. At intervals the stratum of limestone would come suddenly to an end, and then, between it and the next, intervened a considerable bed, in extent and depth, of loose crumbling earth that nothing would bind. Had it been possible to have supported it by means of parapets, we may be sure that a means so obvious would have been resorted to by the French engineers; as it is, the ordinary expedient is, to cut deeper and deeper into the mountain side for a new level, as the side abutting the precipice begins to crack and crumble away. It is only when the road descends to the level of the river that masonry has been called into requisition to any great degree; and this, for the purpose of establishing a solid break-water.

Another important service of the French army, and one which has elicited still greater applause from the native population, is the sinking of Artesian wells. This has been done on the very confines of the desert—at Tamarna for instance—with the most perfect success. As the boring proceeds, intense interest is manifested on the part of the Arabs; and when the gushing waters burst forth, their

* Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 102.

excitement becomes frenzy. The ceremony has brought together every man, woman and child, of every tribe, far and near. All give vent to their feelings in a shriek of joy ; men fire off their guns, women scream, children are plunged screaming into the water by their parents, as though for baptism. Then all salute their benefactors with shouts of gratitude, and kiss their garments. Fruits are served, dancing begins, sheep are slaughtered, in honour of the occasion. A simple miner of the name of Gautherot, seems to be supernaturally inspired on the subject of water ; his indications have never been known to fail, and the supply which they have already produced is incredible. Lastly, the French soldier is frequently employed in the erection of his own barracks, in the laying out of new towns, and upon fortifications. The great penitentiary, or house of detention, near the ruins of Lambesa, is the work of the convicts by whom it is inhabited.

An undertaking of the government, more peculiarly its own, has been the formation of public nursery grounds, where plants are experimented upon, and acclimated, and afterwards sold at a reduced price to the colonist. There is one of these 'pépinières' attached to every town of importance ; but the 'Jardin d'Essai' near Algiers is the most celebrated of them all. The greater part of it is open to the public at all times, and a ticket is readily obtained at the 'bureau' to see the rest. Here the trial of the cotton plant does not seem to have been crowned as yet by complete success. Coffee did remarkably well till it was cut off by a recently severe winter. Among trees, that called by the French, 'Bel-Ombre,' is said to have been introduced by a late English Consul, though it is now common in the country, and from its rapid growth, of some size. Palm, date, cocoa, and banana-trees are numerous and luxuriant, with sago, croton, and castor plants. Many species of the ficus, among them the ficus elastica. Various tribes of the hybiscus, some of them changing colour with the sunbeams,—the rich hues of the scarlet euphorbia,—vast quantities of the bamboo, the sorgo, sugar-cane, papyrus, and a multitude known only to the botanical student. Flowers are not so abundant, but the bright glow and infinite colours of the ordinary convolvulus are a perfect feast for European eyes.

Government has likewise taken measures for promoting the number, and ameliorating the breed, of sheep and

cattle; and native races come off in the autumn, under sanction of the authorities, in the plain below Mustapha, for the purpose of drawing out and improving the qualities of the Arab steed. Agriculture is stimulated by local societies, expositions, and prizes. In 1855 a prize of 20,000f. was given for the best cultivation of cotton; while ten prizes of 5,000f. have been offered for the present year. The whole number of prizes awarded last year by the central and imperial agricultural society for miscellaneous productions, was 27. The following statistics will serve to illustrate the extent to which agriculture has been developed.

In 1855 corn was cultivated upon a superficies of 994,416 hectares, and the value of the crops amounted to 115,872,809f. In 1856 Algeria produced 658 bales of cotton, which were sold at Havre the following year, for the gross sum of 236,185f. By the end of May, 1857, the cultivation of cotton had obtained a development of 1500 hectares. In the year 1856 the silk of Algeria was sold in Lyons at 117f. the kilogramme; and the gross amount which it fetched was 18,356f. Tobacco—all of which is bought up by the government—gave the following details in the month of June, 1857.

	Planters.	Hectares.	Plants.
Algiers	2287	4337,55	123,364,500
Constantine.....	441	366,21	10,433,300
Oran.....	507	387,61	12,999,880
	<u>3235</u>	<u>5091,37</u>	<u>146,797,680*</u>

Sorgo was introduced from China in 1853, and it has been found that the yield averages 50,000 kilogramme-weight of plants per hectare. The palm-date of the desert produces in a year of plenty 300lbs weight of fruit; the opium-plant 627 kilogramme-weight of pods per hectare; bunches of grapes will frequently weigh 5 and 6lbs.

It is now time to speak of the regulations affecting commerce and those which regard navigation. There have been three principal epochs, so to speak, in their history, beginning from 1835. In that year the following decrees of the Governor-General passed into law.

* *Indicateur General de l'Algerie*, p. 12.

1. Transports between France and Algeria to be reserved to the French flag, for all purposes of international commerce; foreign flags to be admitted on payment of 2f. per ton.

2. French goods, and likewise foreign goods that have paid duty in French ports, to be admitted free.

3. All kinds of provisions, materials for building, and other necessary articles, no matter from whence brought, to be admitted free.

4. All other foreign merchandize to pay the $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$ of the duties imposed in the French tariff; and all that is there prohibited, to be allowed to enter under a duty of 12 or 15 per cent.

Thus, during the first period, great encouragement was given to foreign trade, nor is the word 'prohibition' to be found in the tariff. Further, a supplemental ordinance of February 27, 1837, gave permission to foreign flags to effect transports between France and Algeria, on payment of 2f. per ton; and also to ply between one port and another in the latter country. This, however, was so actively made use of, that it was abridged by a counter ordinance of Dec. 7, 1841, in compliance with the loud complaints of the home traders, never to be revived.

It was soon found that these regulations were too favourable to foreign trade, and operated to the disadvantage of the mother-country, and of the mutual intercourse which should exist between her and the colony. Accordingly, their modification was decreed Dec. 16, 1843, and the following new enactments form what we shall call the 2nd period:—

1. Tonnage on foreign flags to be raised from 2 to 4f.

2. Algerian productions to be received into France on payment of about half of the duties imposed by the French tariff.

3. Duties on all foreign manufactures contemplated in art. 4 of the preceding regulations (especially wool and cotton goods,) to be raised from 15 to 30 per cent, and to be charged by weight.

Thus, in the 2nd of the new articles, we have the foundations laid down of a reciprocity between the colony and the mother-country, which has been developed so largely by more recent acts, and seems likely to form the basis of all future systems for some time to come. The Republic had no sooner been established, than the affairs of Algeria

were subjected to increased enquiry, and nothing was left undone to arrive at the best course to be pursued. In 1849 a commission was charged by the War Minister to examine into the state of the colony. Another special commission was appointed by the 'Assemblée législative.' Numerous debates, speeches, and discussions, took place at the Luxembourg, of the Council-General of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, under the presidency of M. Dumas. Among those who spoke on the side which eventually prevailed, were, General Daumas, a name already familiar, and then commissary of the government: M. C. Dupin, president and reporter of the commission: but, above all, M. Dufaure, and M. Passy, who greatly distinguished themselves by their views upon political economy. And it was in the spirit of those views that the 3rd period was inaugurated by the law of January 11, 1851, of which the following will be found a summary:—

1. All natural products of Algeria that are enumerated in a table appended, to enter France duty free.

2. Power given to the Executive to admit free any others that might afterwards appear desirable.

3. Carpets, pipes, burnouses, and other native manufactures, to be likewise duty free as regards France.

4. Foreign goods, of the nature of provisions, building materials, and other articles of the first necessity, to be admitted into Algeria duty free, with the exception of corn, which was subjected to the duties of the French tariff.

5. Foreign manufactures, coming under article 3 of the regulations of 1843, to be still charged as there directed.

6. Foreign iron to pay half of the duties imposed in the French tariff.

7. Goods prohibited in the French tariff still to be allowed to enter at a duty of from 20 to 25 per cent.

Hitherto trade by land with Tunis and Morocco had been interdicted; a decree of August 11, 1853, re-opened it. Finally, a custom-house ordinance of July 26, 1856, gave power to the Executive to decree, provisionally, the free importation into France, of manufactured goods not comprised in the law of 1851.

Let us now examine the figures which belong to these different periods: In 1835 the value of imports and exports amounted together only to 20 million francs. In

1845 it reached 83 millions, of which 75 were imports, and but 8 exports, the foreign share of the whole being upwards of 40, or one half. In 1846 (which was signalized by a great increase in the army, then raised to 100,000 men,) the imports rose to 111 millions, of which two-thirds were French, while the exports had also risen to 9 millions, but here 4 only were for France, and 5 for foreign destinations. Down to the present year importations between France and Algeria, average, it is said, 85 millions, and exports 35; between Algeria and foreign countries, exports are given at 6, and imports upwards of 18 millions.* It is easy to deduce corollaries from these figures. Down to the year 1845 foreign trade was encouraged, and got the start of France; but from the time that the regulations of 1843 got into play, the tide turned, and France began to have the lion's share, which she has kept ever since. It may be asked, on the other hand, has commerce advanced as rapidly since this has been the case, as it did, and seemed likely to do, previously? The steady advance of exports upon imports betokens something like progress in the colony.

We are indebted mainly for the above 'résumé' to a well-written paper in the '*Revue des deux mondes*,'† by M. G. Lavollée, though we have not taken his figures on trust, or without convincing ourselves of their general impartiality. And we are equally disposed to accept upon mature consideration, the correctness of his deductions. The existing regulations may be described in a few words as a system of free trade between the colony and the mother-country, without absolutely interdicting the former from trade with foreigners. We believe it to be no less sound in argument, than borne out in precedent, to assert that, as a general rule, colonial tariffs are framed upon the model of tariffs already existing in the mother-country; and that consequently before establishing absolute free-trade in Algeria, free-trade must have been first accepted in France. We believe such to have been the course of our own colonial administration. '*La metro-*

* We have extracted this last from the *Indicateur General de l'Algerie*; but there must be a typographical error in the sum total, p. 71.

† That of Oct. 15, 1858.

pole,' he proceeds, ' assure à ses colonies un marché privilégié pour leurs récoltes : et elle demande en retour que les colonies consomment de préférence ses produits fabriqués.....'* It is easy to say that the colony may not particularly care for the free entrance of their goods into the mother-country, having fair prospects of as good a market elsewhere. But while France protects Algeria with a standing army of between 60 and 100,000 men, and, under existing circumstances, the colony would not be safe for a day were it withdrawn,—it is only fair that her interests should be considered, and in all due proportion guaranteed to her ; and that so long as she continues to take all that Algeria is capable of exporting at a remunerative price, the colony should submit to purchase her manufactures in preference to all others, even though, in some respects, they might be had better and cheaper elsewhere. All which consideration is further enhanced by the immense sums which France expends annually for the advancement of the well-being of Algeria, in addition to the protection which her troops afford. Otherwise it might well be made a question whether the commerce of Algeria would not have increased more rapidly by foreign trade, both in the matter of exports and imports, than it has done since its operations have been so materially limited to the mother-country. The figures themselves indicate that such might have been the case, though we are not prepared to say with what foreign countries the bulk of her trade would have been. This would of course have depended on the nature, extent, and quality of her exports, compared with those of other countries more remote ; and upon the nature and quantity of goods which she was capable of consuming in return. Meanwhile this writer shows irrefragably that it would be most unwise to apply the French tariff, in all its rigours, to foreign goods entering Algeria ;† and also that France is sufficiently protected by the regulations which are now in force. Of manufactured cotton goods, for instance, to the value of 20 millions of francs, which were imported into Algeria during 1857, France furnished 16, and foreign countries

* p. 890.

† He particularly instances, iron, steel, timber, agricultural implements, &c.,—why not coal ?

only 4. Of woollen goods to the value of 6 millions, France furnished 5½ millions, and foreigners but 300,000. Of pottery (the duty being 25 per cent on foreign ware,) the share furnished by France amounted in weight to 721,000 kilogrammes, and by foreigners only to 154,000. On these grounds he would support the existing tariff with some modifications, and he cites M. Duval, and M. Dupré in favour of his views. We believe them to be shared equally by the bulk of the traders of Marseilles and of Algiers; and consequently anticipate no greater changes in the Algerine tariff than such as may be required to give full development to the law of 1851, or the law of the 3rd period.

Thus much for colonization and commerce in the hands of the French Government. It remains to be seen how the colonists themselves have fared. This is, in part, evidenced by their numbers and progressive increase. In 1845, the whole European population! amounted only to 75,867. By the end of the year following, it had risen to 109,400; then it retrograded, then increased; then retrograded once more, till finally, in 1850, it rose to be 125,963. The great rise in 1846, has been, with justice, connected with a corresponding increase in the army. "The largest army," says M. Morrell, "that France has ever had in Algeria, was that voted to Marshal Bugeaud, in 1846, amounting to 100,000 French, and 25,000 natives."*... Again, in 1848, the number of Europeans exceeded the number in 1847, by upwards of 11,000. It was stated in the *Moniteur* two autumns since, that no less than 11,000 had been condemned, in consequence of the events of the month of June, 1848, to be deported into Algeria. It may be true that a majority of these were afterwards pardoned by the President of the Republic, so that only 600 of them remained. But, once more, owing to the events of December 1851, 11,200 were similarly sentenced; and up to the birth of the Prince Imperial, 1058 of these still remained. These are significant facts in the annals of a colony! Between 1850 and 52, population retrograded slightly, probably by reason of those who returned home. From 1853 downwards, there has been a steady increase, till, in 1857, we find the numbers 167,670. But here,

*Algeria, by J. R. Morrell. London: 1854; p. 391.

again, we are compelled to insert a qualification, in one sense disparaging to the numbers; in another sense, a high compliment to the sanitary exertion of the French army before noticed. It consists in the following table of births and deaths. "The births in the three years from 1847 to 1849, were as follows:

	1847.			1848.			1849.		
	French	Foreign	Total	French	Foreign	Total	French	Foreign	Total.
Algiers	1380	1141	2521	1307	974	2281	1600	1080	2680
Oran	540	478	1018	659	660	1319	795	832	1627
Constantine ...	500	244	744	455	292	747	595	304	899
Total	...	...	4283	...	...	4347	...	...	5026
"The deaths were									
Algiers	1683	1283	2966	1416	1097	2513	2112	1806	3918
Oran	497	722	1219	698	679	1377	1861	1697	3558
Constantine ...	552	426	978	556	389	945	1916	1101	3017
Total	...	...	5163	...	...	4835	...	...	10493*

Thus, in the course of these three years, the deaths always exceeded, and, in one case, the cholera year, actually doubled the births. We are happy to be able to announce that the proportion has changed sides since; for, during† the four years succeeding 1852, the births have exceeded the deaths by 12,771! Thus, allowing it to be true, that the annual increase of the population from 1852 to 56, has been 9000, it would be equally true that upwards of 3000 of these were due to the babes that had been ushered into the world, and are not to be confounded with new settlers. Once for all, these 167,670, have been classed as follows:

French ...	92,738	} 66,544	} 167,670.
Spaniards ...	41,237		
Portuguese ...	112		
Italians ...	9,113		
Maltese ...	6,841		
Irish ...	138		
Belgians ...	464		
Germans ...	5,567		
Poles ...	232		
Swiss ...	1,743		
Greek ...	33		
Diverse ...	1,064†		

*Morrell, p. 351.

† Indicateur General de l'Algerie, p. 38.

‡ Ibid. p. 37.

Or, in another point of view :

Men	68,095	} 167,670
Women	50,199	
Children	49,376	

Thus we see that the proportion of French to Spaniards, is but 2 to 1, which is the same proportion that Spaniards bear to the remainder. Consequently, the number of men being under 70,000, we cannot reckon French adults of the male sex, above 40,000; and, of these, very many, we well know to, have been born and bred in Algeria, the offspring of the first settlers. How many more are paid officials, agents of the police, of the custom-house, of the market, of the weights and measures, of the tobacco service, of the domains, mines, and nursery grounds; of the forests, roads, and bridges; of the tribunals, of the mairies, of the prefectures; servants and workmen depending on these establishments; schoolmasters, sworn interpreters, contractors for the army, suttlers, shop-keepers? When these shall have been deducted, how many French males will remain of mature age, who have come professedly as colonists, and who are fairly devoting themselves to the work of colonization, unaided by, and independent of, the government?* Is it that the French, as a nation, are indisposed to leave home, and found colonies; or is it that impediments are thrown in their way? And yet, from time to time, government *ordains* that *colonists shall be supplied from France*, and charges the prefects of the different departments to look them out, and import them.† A strange way, doubtless, of peopling a colony; and what we should call beginning at the wrong end! However, why do not Germans, Italians, and even Spaniards, flock hither in greater numbers? "Ireland," it has been said, "with its six million of wretched inhabitants, sends, in one year, more emigrants to America than France with its 36 millions, has sent in a score of years,

* Mr. Blakesley reckons the adult male agriculturalist in A. of all nations, at 10,000, p. 418.

† For example, 6000 were decreed to be sent out in 1849. See Morrell, p. 373. In the same way a decree *creates* a town from time to time.

across the Mediterranean.* But we will not institute comparisons, both because Ireland is very differently situated from France, and because, undoubtedly, emigration, both to the United States, and to Australia, has been unnaturally wrought upon by the gold-diggings. We will judge of Algeria solely by her own figures, her own circumstances, and her own regulations. The first inducement held out to the candidate for emigration, is a free passage from Marseilles, for himself and his household goods. So far so good. There are certain formalities to be gone through previously, to be sure, but the boon is never withheld; and nobody can complain of the accommodation of the French boats of the *Messageries Impériales*. But, on his landing, his troubles begin,—he must have a passport! Going to people a wilderness, a place of exile for departed mal-contents—he still must apply for his passport when he lands, as though about to travel through fair France, and carry it about with him till he is fairly installed, or he may get into grief. If he is a superior workman, in addition to his passport, he must be provided with the “*livret d’ouvriers*,” as in the mother-country. Twenty-five centimes is not a very exorbitant charge for a record so precious, for, unless he has one, he cannot get into employment! Greater care was never taken to make the shoe fit. Its materials must be white paper; † it must be endorsed and countersigned by the proper authorities, and sealed with their seal. In its first pages must be printed, the law which prescribes it, and the penalties attending informality. It must give the Christian and surname of the workman, his age, birth-place, description, and profession. It must state whether he usually works for one, or for many. In the former cases, the name and abode of the master with whom he works, or has worked in the last instance. There are many more specifications, but we are compelled to put them on one side, with “*Ohe! jam satis est!*” And when this book has been worn out, or lost, he must go through the prescribed formalities for replacing it by a new one. This, in a country where a man is obliged to

* *Tricolor on the Atlas*, p. 391.

† *Guide du Colon* publié d’après les documents fournis par le Ministère de la Guerre, p. 48.

get work when and where he can, where towns are few, and those few scarcely formed, and where the outlying colonies are leagues away from those few, and scarcely formed, in the midst of a desert! Is our immigrant a sportsman, he must spend at least two days in some metropolis, to obtain, at a cost of 30 francs, and after interminable formalities, a "permis de chasse!" In a country where wild boars, hyenas, panthers, and lions, abound,—where it is always better to be provided with a gun, lest some stray Hajute should be tempted to fathom the depths of your pocket, steal your sheep, rob your garden—you are still bound to go through the same forms as the cockney sportsman in France, and to pay for the right of killing those very wild animals, for the extirpation of which government itself offers rewards, or of filling your larder with game, in a locality where perhaps meat is not always to be had! Or is your immigrant possessed with the idea of setting up works? There is the same "Quête de commode et incommode" to be gone through previously that is obligatory both in France and in Belgium. In a country where there is elbow-room in abundance, even in the principal towns, and where, outside them, there are leagues without inhabitants, nobody can choose a site for works, or set them up, till the full preliminary programme has been gone through; notice published, objections heard, advantages set forth, leave given. He cannot, as in England, set up works on his own responsibility, and take the chance of the Arabs, or panthers, or jackalls, inditing him for a nuisance. Then too, he may have just set up his distillery, when a decree is received from France, prohibiting distillation from grain; or else he may be a butcher or a baker, with a small capital, and lo! he is commanded, in the name of the Emperor, either to sell his meat at a reduced price, or else to keep a reserve by him, of corn, or in flour, equal to the quantity required for the consumption of his trade for three months.* Distillation from grain was recently prohibited in Algeria as well as France; what assurance is there, therefore, that those subsequent decrees respecting butchers and bakers in France, may not be imposed

* See an excellent article thereon in the Times of November 22, 1858. The decree respecting butchers came out in October, 1855.

on the butchers and bakers of the colony? Poor Algeria! it pays dearly for the glory of being "assimilated" to the seat of empire! But is our immigrant a simple colonist, ambitious of a concession of land from government? He gets it upon application to the proper authorities, it is true, but upon what conditions? First and foremost of them all, this—*his means must be made known to the government*; "concessions," says the official guide, "apply to lands not yet under cultivation; and upon colonists themselves fall the whole expenses of installation, and of getting the ground into order. Consequently, concessions are always made in proportion to their means of action duly certified."* As if it could not be ascertained that a man had capital, without prying into his very account-books. Further conditions of a similar nature are superadded:

"Un délai est fixé pour l'exploitation de chaque concession. A l'expiration de ce délai, si le concessionnaire a mis ses terrains en pleine valeur, il en devient propriétaire définitif au même titre que s'il les avait achetés. S'il les a laissés incultes, il fait retour au domaine de l'Etat. Enfin s'il n'y a exécuté que quelques travaux insuffisants, ils sont vendus aux enchères publiques à son profit, sur une mise à prix égale à la valeur de ces travaux."†

Thus, from beginning to end, there is a system of inquisition on the part of the State, that is truly vexatious. It grants favours, but on condition of continually looking into your private affairs. It is not enough that a man should have laid before government a statement of his means, but he is pestered without end by domiciliary visits, to see what he is doing, how he is getting on, and whether he will fulfil the terms of his concession. He cannot begin where he will, accelerate what he most wants, leave out what he can dispense with, for a time, at least; he must work according to the rules of a system prescribed by others, and what is still worse, under their surveillance. And the chances are that when he has done, his work will be objected to, and his concession revoked. That such has been the ordinary fate of concessionists, is proved by the fact that concessions have universally gone out of favour for some time past; and officials themselves

* Guide du Colon, p. 57.

† Ibid, p. 58.

advise the purchase of land in preference. They are regarded as parts of a system that has become obsolete ; and the sale of land by public auction is the procedure which the administration is beginning gradually to substitute in their room. Is our immigrant therefore, willing to purchase land from the government ? But a short time ago, this was not so easy. When the "Bureaux Arabes" were in existence, it somehow or other happened, that when Europeans had set their hearts upon a piece of ground, some Kaid or Agha had been beforehand with them. Even Frenchmen complained loudly, that natives were preferred before them ; and it was asserted in our own hearing by one fully competent to speak, that unless the "Bureaux Arabes" were suppressed, the whole of the land would revert to the Arabs ; and the "granary of Italy" would continue to be the wilderness that for twelve centuries it had already been in their hands. Our immigrant usually found it the best policy to buy rather from individuals, than from the government. Some ruined concessionist, some covetous old Moor, supplied his best chance. We would fain hope for Algeria ; nevertheless, unless the French government will cease legislating for Algeria as for France—will cut down formalities, abstain from surveillance, allow individuals to go where they please, project what they please, do what they please, so long as they do not violate the public peace, unmolested by police, and unfettered by restrictions ; it is quite certain that there will never be colonists in sufficient numbers to people the country. Englishmen will not come, for they have already got all the liberty that they could desire, in their own happy land, and in their vast colonies. Germans, Italians, Swiss, Spaniards, will not come, because with them, one principal reason for abandoning fatherland, is, that they may be more free. Liberty is the only price for which they are content to barter hearth and home. The Continent is tied up with artificial restrictions ; but better, far better, for Europeans to remain in

* It has been quaintly, but truly observed : "It is over-nursing which chokes the African plantation."—*Tricolor on the Atlas*, p. 397. See an excellent paper by M. Duval, in the *Journal des Economistes* 2me Serie 4e Année, especially the end p. 373.

their own country, under those with which they are already familiar, than to come to Algeria to be bound, hand and foot, by restrictions, which have the additional burdensomeness of being strange and foreign. It may be otherwise with Frenchmen who have known them from childhood.

But then, lastly, how can France supply colonists under her existing laws?—with her stationary population, and where every male that is born, is liable to service in the army. From his cradle, every Frenchman knows that a military profession is the one to which his country binds him; and that unless the lot shields him, or money can find him a substitute, he must abandon every other secular vocation or pursuit in life, to be a soldier, when the time comes. He cannot claim exemption on the ground that he is preparing to be a colonist—has he emigrated without satisfying the law first, he is liable to be recalled home; * and when his seven years of service are over, he is no longer the fittest subject to go forth as a colonist, let his intentions remain ever so fixed. It is not, therefore, that Frenchmen are naturally unfitted for colonization or for commerce; it is their system of conscription that unfits them. Its operations are felt most just by the very class that would otherwise become colonists or merchants. The lot hangs over them, like the sword of Damocles, and they can settle to nothing till its issues are known. Up to the age of 20, they can fix upon nothing in life. Also, there is an attractiveness in the military profession, which makes them resign themselves to the necessity of even its uncertainty; but once soldiers, there is an end of the colonist and of the merchant, compared with what otherwise they might have achieved in their case.

* We are indebted to an eminent legal authority for the following data. 1. Le recrutement n'existe pas en Algérie, même pour les Français. A plus forte raison, pour les colons étrangers. 2. Un Français qui va fixer son domicile en Algérie, avant d'avoir satisfait à la loi du recrutement, n'en reste pas moins soumis aux obligations de cette loi. 3. L'exemption de recrutement en Algérie doit s'entamer en ce sens, qu'elle s'applique, soit aux Français nés en Algérie, soit aux Français mineurs à l'époque où leur parents sont venus se fixer en Algérie à titre non précaire...."

But the stagnant character * of the population of France is a still more serious impediment to colonization, especially when the system that engenders it, is extended to the colony. There, at least, the "*jus trium liberorum*" would answer even better than a prize for cotton or tobacco. Why engraft the great social evil of France upon a new country? The French are proud of their Napoleonic code; and it has certainly the merits of system, conciseness, and freedom from obsolete legislation. But we tell them that the intentions, which it embodied, are not for the advancement of liberty, but the perpetuation of despotism! One of its favourite affectations is, that it has annihilated, at one blow, the monstrous principle of primogeniture, the preference of male issue, and the system of entails. It has done all these things effectually, we grant; *but has it left a man in any one sense more free to do what he will with his own?* And what other influences has it *not* crushed besides aristocracy? Evidently it was not the intention of their legislature merely to cut down every tall poppy, but to reduce every flower in the garden to the same proportions. Plutocracy, or moneyed pre-eminence, is even more rudely dealt with by the French code, than aristocracy; and nobody, who has studied those enactments, can fail to see that the object of the legislature, was to cut down every powerful influence between the masses and the supreme head of the government. And wonderfully well has this end been achieved, under the plea of annihilating aristocracy; for the French nation, at the present day, present the largest aggregate

* The population of France during four periods of five years, was

In 1836 :	in 1841 :	in 1846 :	in 1851.
33,540,910.	34,230,178.	35,400,486.	35,783,170.

Between 1836 and 1850, the births were	{	1836-40.....	959,431.
		1841-45.....	976,630.
		1846-50.....	949,594.

On the other hand, the following is said to have been the average of births between 1771-84, the whole population at the end of the preceding century (Encycl. Brit, vol. x., art. France, p. 276) having been found to be about 20,000,000. { 1771-80.....940,935.
1781-84.....964,924.

So that with a population increased by at least 10,000,000, the births stand pretty much as they did a century back. Journal des Ecom. 2me. serie. 4me. année. p. 351-69.

of intelligent little nobodies to be met with in the world. Every one is, by law, just as big as his neighbour, and no bigger; and it is only those, who are in the employment of the government, who are enabled to raise their heads above their brethren. Independent men of wealth and capital they have none, as a general rule; for the moment that a man accumulates a fortune, it is the due of his children, if he have any; and neither by marriage settlement, gift during his lifetime, nor testament after his decease, can he prevent all of it being cut up at his death into almost as many portions as there are children. To be able to dispose of more than a fourth part as he pleases, he must have less than three children; to be able to dispose of the half of it, he cannot allow himself more than one child. Such is the law of succession in the boasted code! Never was social equality purchased at a greater sacrifice of individual liberty. Large capitals, therefore, and large families are, as logicians would say, in contradictory opposition under the Code Napoleon. They have been found irreconcilable in France; but which of the two a rising colony can best do without, is a problem, which the ruin of all French colonies, from the want of both equally, will leave unsolved. It will be enough to point out a few of the baneful effects of this arbitrary law upon a noble people, which the French certainly are:—

1. The numerical decrease, or, at all events, stagnation, of the population of France, for some time past, the births hardly exceeding the deaths.—
2. The dearth of capital, for it is only made to be unmade, and never can be kept together beyond a single life, unless there is but one child to inherit.—
3. The horrible expedients to prevent child-birth after marriage, now unhappily so common in France, when this one child has been born.—
4. The total absence in France, of all that we call private or family collections of pictures, works of art, historical curiosities, libraries, and the like, at least, such as are not merely ephemeral.—
5. The total absence of any independent powerful influences between the masses, and the head of the government, save perhaps, but only perhaps, that of the army.—
6. The utter inability of individuals to embark in any scheme of importance without help from the government; and, consequently, the want of self-reliance, and of independence of action, that is thereby engendered. All these drawbacks to national prosperity Algeria is beginning to

feel, and will continue to feel, till they are removed, or till they involve her ruin. She cannot get capital from France; for who can impart that which he has not to give? and under the Code Napoleon, she will never be able to accumulate capital in her own borders. She cannot get colonists from France, where large families are wanting; neither will French colonists in Algeria increase and multiply for the same reason that exists in the mother country. From our own experience, we should say that there were not two in five Frenchmen out there, who were not in the employ, either of the government, or the municipality. When Napoleon III. tried to alter the law and create a majorat in the case of the Duc de Malakoff, it was for the sorry purpose of bolstering up a paltry title of his own creation; and he met with the opposition which the attempt deserved. Let him propose a law enabling every man to do what he will with his own throughout France, and he will probably meet with better success, and more important results. For why should not France have large families, and large capitalists, and large colonies, as well as England?

We conclude, therefore, by repeating: 1, that towards the native population the acts of the French government have been characterized by wisdom and moderation, though we do not feel certain that they will meet with the entire success that they deserve, or attain to the results that have been anticipated.* 2. That the general measures adopted by the French government for the security of life and property in Algeria, have been excellent, and that, by a series of internal improvements, that country has been admirably laid out for the purposes of colonization. But then, we say further, that the application of the laws of the mother-country to the colony, will, if persevered in, annihilate the good results that would otherwise have ensued; and that invitations will be issued in vain to European settlers, if their liberty is to be placed under the same restraints, and subjected to the same

* 'Par elle (Algérie) nous devons montrer a nos detracteurs que nous sommes capables non seulement de fonder et d'organizer une colonie, mais encore de nous assimiler la race indigène, au point que, sur un sol conquis, on ne reconnaitra plus les vaincus !'..... *Revue des deux Mondes*, Oct. 15, 1858, p. 889.

system of espionage, that is deemed necessary in the over-developed and highly artificial state of society throughout France. Lastly, we say, that as long as the conscription, and the laws regulating the succession of property, remain in their full force in France, she never can hope to be the mother of a colonizing or commercial people.

We have endeavoured to treat these subjects with the utmost impartiality, and have purposely abstained from instituting comparisons that might excite prejudice. It is our sincere wish to offer suggestions in a friendly spirit; and should our criticisms provoke stricture, our spontaneous answer would be, 'Strike, but hear.' Meanwhile let us not hesitate to recommend to our countrymen not to pass over Algeria in their polyplanetic travels. For the invalid, for the sportsman, for the ethnologist or antiquarian, it offers a world of attractions, and can be traversed securely in the midst of French refinements, and with economy. A reverend author, not inexperienced in the arts of the 'chasse,' or of the 'cuisine,' may be quoted for experiences of Algiers in 1857. First his table of climatology.

Winter,	...	...	...	...	...	62.13°*
Spring,	...	...	...	...	...	61.04°
Summer,	...	...	...	...	...	75.09°
Autumn,	...	...	...	...	...	78.26°

"The mean temperature of Algiers for the whole year being 62.13°, it approaches that of Malta, but exceeds it by 2°, Malaga by 3°, Madeira by 4°, Rome by 9°, Nice by 10°, and Pau by 13°. Cairo is 3° higher (mean): yet its winter is 4° colder than that of Algiers."

Next the sanitary state of the towns.

"From three to five in the morning the Arab scavengers swept the streets, and carried off the refuse of the city on their unshod and noiseless donkeys.....It is quite sufficient evidence against Homer that he never visited Algiers as it now is, or he would not have failed to give it the happy distinction it so well deserves, that of the well-scavenged city.....'"†

Then the account of his 'ménage.'

* Algiers in 1857, by the Rev. E. W. L. Davies, p. 3.

† Ibid, p. 20.

"For two rooms, comfortably furnished, but of small dimensions, (in the Rue d'Orléans, not perhaps the most fashionable, and 'au seconde,') with a yet smaller kitchen, we paid 60f. a month, for which sum, in advance, linen, crockery, cooking, and attendance, were included.....The fish they sold was good and cheap, that is to say, cheap, if you bought it at half the price they asked for it, and good, if you visited the market at the right time. For instance, weather permitting, a pair of soles, a foot long, might be bought for one franc; a John-dory (St. Pierre) large enough for four persons, at ten sous; small red mullet (rouget) at a sou each; and sardines, fresh and delicious, at three sous a pound; besides, there were whiting, herring, mackerel, turbot, white-bait, and flying-fish. Then, in the vegetable market, green peas were to be had all the winter; wild asparagus, and new potatoes in February, and Alpine strawberries, besides all the vegetables, and many more, than we have in England, in great profusion and excellence. Game of almost every kind, from a quail to a wild boar, found its way to Algiers throughout the year.....Coffee, as prepared by the native Moors, excellent.....good cow's milk at eight sous a quart; goat's milk, fresh, regular, and abundant, always obtainable at your very doors....."—pp. 16-19.

• The general security of the traveller.

"It will be satisfactory to the traveller to learn, that with the exception of those districts in Kabylia which have not yet acknowledged the supremacy of the French arms, and from all accounts they are now but few, he may wander with the utmost security from one end of Algeria to the other; from Tunis to Angad-du-Tell, on the confines of Morocco; from the Mediterranean Sea to the tribe of Beni-Mzal, on the borders of the Great Desert. This security is of course wholly due to French management."

Mr. Davies, though a clergyman of the Established Church, has placed first and foremost among his proofs of the possibility of successful colonization, when undertaken in a spirit of manly perseverance, in a land at once so favoured and so well assured, the great Trappist establishment of Staoheli, his description of which carries us back to the agricultural triumphs of the Benedictines in the Middle Ages, and to the foundation of our own glorious, though now alas! dismantled abbeys. We shall make no apology for extracting somewhat copiously from the interesting chapter which contains it.

"At a distance of eighteen kilometres, or less than twelve English miles from Algiers, on the road to Koleah, stands the grand monastery of La Trappe, consecrated in 1845, containing ninety brethren of that society, and presided over by P. Marie François

Régis, Abbé de Staoheli. It is situated on a wide plain, on which the palmetta grows in luxuriance, and which, from its high and airy elevation, would be selected as the spot of all others where rude health might be enjoyed. But, until it was well drained by the indefatigable monks, it was found to be far otherwise; miasmatic vapours prevailed alarmingly, and these, aided by the rigorous and self-denying diet of the monks, carried them off in vast numbers. At present, however, to judge by their ruddy faces, and indeed by their own account of the place, it is as healthy as any part of the world.....

"The establishment at Staoheli is sufficiently remarkable in its features to require no surreptitious aid to render it an object of the deepest interest to every thinking mind; and it is impossible for any one to visit it without pleasure and advantage to himself.....

"The monastery is a plain, square building, distinguished by no architectural pretension whatever; it has an open quadrangle in the centre, which is ornamented by many curious flowers, orange trees in full bearing, and a fountain of clear and beautiful water, in which gold and silver fish sport in their element. Spacious out-buildings, intended for farm and other purposes, are attached to the monastery; while outside of these a high wall, encompassing one hundred acres of garden, vineyards, orchards, and cemetery, surrounds the home enclosure. Beyond this again, the cultivated farm encircles the whole, in a ring fence, by the produce of which the establishment is maintained, and the simple wants of the brotherhood amply supplied."—p. 63, and seq.

Mr. Davies, however, omits to state that their revenues had become so considerable as to have excited great jealousy on the part of the less fortunate colonists, and created a general outcry against some immunities granted by the government to these industrious monks. He next visited the convent in detail, was much impressed with the devotions which he witnessed in the chapel, and then, after an excellent breakfast, on which he passes a handsome eulogy, goes over the farm and grounds.

"Our next object after breakfast was to look over the farm, and to see how they practised the doctrine taught by the big book in the library. The crops of wheat were the most favoured of the cereals, and were in strong and promising condition; but the seed had been broad-cast, and whether from rabbits or bad sowing, presented a somewhat patchy appearance. The barley was thin and scarcely covered the nakedness of the ground; but the vines, which occupied at least forty acres, seemed to be thriving, and from the clean and well hoed furrows, gave every indication of good management. The grape-blight, 'oudium tuckeri,' for which sulphur is proved to be a specific, had committed no ravages here. The arti-

ficial grass, for the land had not long been 'laid down,' was excellent; the fences, however, were our special admiration, and were such as Captain Lamb's old Vivian, or Lord Waterford's 'the Switcher,' would alone have faced. They were thus formed—outside a row of the cross-thorn acacia, then a row of aloes, then one of prickly pears, and then a broad ditch; a veritable 'cheveux-de-frise,' and a terrible fence to cross under any circumstances. The cattle, in point of size, were finer than any we had yet seen in Algeria, but they were coarse, mouse-coloured beasts, large in bone and rough in their skins. Vernon, however, suggested that probably a thick hairy jacket was a great advantage in a country infested by mosquitoes and the much dreaded æstrus, to which the monk bowed assent. Cocks and hens, for the omelets, swarmed in the farm-yard. There were also a few long-legged pigs, and a capital heap of old stable manure, which a monk was forking over at that very time. Also, at different points in the farm, there were corn-mills with overshot wheels, aqueducts, reservoirs, a bath-house, and lastly lime-kilns, which they burned with the wild olive instead of coal, and the quality of the lime was excellent."...P. 69 and seq.

Even Mr. Blakesley, by no means a friendly critic, speaks to the flourishing condition of some of the other French settlements.

"Jemappes, one of the few successful agricultural colonies of the French, dates from the year 1848 only. Like almost every other village, it is provided with a loop-holed wall, as a defence against any sudden attack of the natives, and its situation is on a low mamelon, in the midst of a very fertile plain, surrounded by hills as yet uncleared. The water is excellent and abundant, and the whole population appeared healthy, cheerful, and thriving. The inn in which I found quarters was a very humble one, but it was perfectly clean, and I got an excellent dinner, and every attention that I could wish. The population of the village is somewhat under 600. There are several Germans among them, and some Maltese, Piedmontese, and Spaniards, but the bulk of the population is French.....My host, who had not a fault to find with his position, and acknowledged that he had grown comparatively rich, told me that he did not intend to stay more than two or three years longer. Yet this is in every respect a prosperous settlement. The soil reminded me in appearance of the lower part of the valley of the Broll, near Rolandsecke on the Rhine. The people say that it will produce anything whatever, and that as soon as ever a tree is put in it seems to grow as by magic. Two crops of potatoes are produced annually, and three cuttings of tobacco. One man told me that one hundred mulberry trees, on which he had expended only fifty days labour, gave him a silk crop worth 4,000 francs. The vine

and the fig also thrive admirably, and I was informed that the sweet chestnut was the only tree which did not succeed."...p. 260.

In short, scorpions and wild boars formed the only drawback to this favoured locality.

In his way to Constantine the same author passed through the little village of S. Antoine,

"Which is, unlike its neighbours Damremont and Vallée, extremely prosperous. As at Jemappes, the water is plentiful and good, and the soil favourable to all products except the chestnut. There are thirty 'concessionnaires,' all French, whose grants were of not less than five hectares each; but, as elsewhere, the labourers are mostly Germans, Piedmontese, and other foreigners."...p. 270.

The French settlers of course were always talking of returning home when they had amassed sufficient means, just as was formerly the case, when our great colony was in its infancy, with our Australian emigrants.

Mr. Blakesley was justly entranced on his first view of Constantine, "the capital of the Numidian kings.....on the noblest site," in his estimation, "in the whole world." p. 274. His description is well written, and by no means overdrawn. In fact, we have never seen a photograph—of the many that have been taken of it—which conveyed any adequate idea of the grandeur of the reality; and no less faithful is his account of the valley of Hammam Meskoutine, where he visited "the exceedingly curious (mineral) springs, which throw Carlsbad completely into the shade."

"It is one of the loveliest spots I saw in Africa, and if it ever becomes a fashionable resort, which the Algerian newspapers are continually proclaiming as its approaching destiny, it may be made almost a fairy-land, the abundance of water and the temperature of the soil admitting of the cultivation of even tropical plants." p. 350.

From the remains which exist it was doubtless a far-famed watering-place in the days of the Romans.

In conclusion, we should recommend any of our readers who may be incredulous of the vast resources of a country where Sallust found the means of amassing in a single year a fortune so gigantic as to entitle him to be considered one of the wealthiest of the Romans, only to visit the collection of Algerine productions in Paris,—when open, and where situated, they will learn from Galignani,—and to look through the great work published by the government

at the head of our list. Let it only be taken into consideration that Algeria has not been French territory above a quarter of a century, and that it is still inhabited by three millions of some of the most untameable races under the sun, and we may safely affirm that no traveller who visits Algeria will find the foregoing extracts exaggerated, or will come away without acknowledging his obligations to the French. In their own country they exhibit many native fascinations, but strangers themselves on a new soil, their courtesy and hospitality to the stranger has a genuineness about it which Englishmen, above all others, can appreciate. Nobody that we know of, who has visited Algeria within the last ten years, will deny that Col. Walmsley has hit upon the only assignable cause why it has been hitherto so little frequented by our excursionists, when he says,—

“I wonder more travellers do not turn their winter wanderings towards Algeria, and that a greater portion of that wave of tourists which annually discharges its accumulation of sight-seers over the continent does not break on this African shore. It is true that a sprinkling of English and Germans do get as far as Algiers, drive through the romantic gorges of La Chiffa, and wander among the orange groves of Blidah ; nay, I have even seen the spectacled nose of the English tourist looming large among the mighty cedars of the unrivalled forests of Teniet El Haad. Oran, Bona, and Philippeville, all boast of their little contingent of strangers, some in search of pleasure, some looking after health. But these visitors are not numerous, and considering the great facilities afforded, and the different nature of the scenery and inhabitants from those to be met with in the usual beaten track followed by the ordinary tourist, I cannot help wondering at it. *This must result from the fact that Algeria is almost unknown to the ordinary traveller.*” P. 24.

ART. II.—1. *Reisen im Norden.* Von Matthias Alexander Castren. 1855. [*Travels in the North,* By M. A. Castren.]

2. *Reise nach dem Nordosten des europäischen Russlands, durch die Tundra der Samojeden.* Von Alexander Gustav Schrenck. 1854. [*Travels to the North-Eastern parts of European Russia, through the Samojede Tundra.* By A. G. Schrenck.] 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 730-568. Dorpat, 1848, 1854.

THE districts of Russian Europe, east of the White Sea, are even less known than those of Russian Lapland. The English vessels bound to Archangel, approach the shores of the latter country ere they enter the White Sea ; but no sail cheers the eye of the wanderer on the desolate coast which extends from Archangel to the Oural Mountains. No roads traverse this huge extent of country ; no towns are met with, even on its mightiest rivers ; but yet the country is not altogether destitute of inhabitants, though they are a wild and nomade race, and are rarely visited by civilized man. The Samojede of the two Tundra or deserts are now, since the conversion to Christianity of the Russian Lapps, almost the only heathens on this side of the Oural Mountains. Two hundred years ago and more, this wild nation was not unknown to the British merchant ; for we find in the curious volumes of old Purchas, that in 1611, the Anglo-Russian Company of London, under the presidency of Sir Thomas Smith, despatched ships to the Petschora river, to open out a direct commerce with the people on the banks of that great stream. Some of the English adventurers, and among these Josias Logan, and William Pursglove, actually wintered at Pustosersk, and, on their return, gave a full account of their travels. Had the speculation proved a successful one, we should long ere this have exhausted the subject of the Tundra and its Samojedes ; but after 1615, the English ships ceased their voyages, and up to the present day, the nation has continued almost entirely isolated from the rest of Europe. The tract of country inhabited by the Samojedes, extends for about five hundred miles along the northern coast of Russia, from Mesen to the Oural Mountains, on the confines of Asia. It is divided into the greater and the lesser Tundra,

by the great river the Petschora, which, rising in the Oural Mountains, runs for about three hundred miles in a westerly direction, at a distance of about 180 miles from the Frozen Ocean, and then, turning suddenly at Ustzulmsk to the north, enters that sea below Pustosersk. On the west of this great river, is the lesser or Timan Tundra, which extends about 150 miles to Mesen, while east of the Petschora, is the great desert morass of the Bolschemelsk Tundra, reaching three hundred miles and more to the confines of Asia. But the Tundras are not entirely morass; sandy hillocks, perfectly dry, are occasionally to be found there.

“ Around us, then, was nothing but the Tundra, an almost dead level of morass thinly sprinkled with bushes, and varied only by a few pools formed on its surface by the rains. But even in summer, this district does not present the usual obstacles to land carriage that might be expected from a morass, for a little way below the surface there is ever the permanently frozen ground ice to support the traveller. The surface is rarely thawed more than a foot in depth, so that the sledges can glide with tolerable facility over the watery grass and moss, though occasionally dry sand hills, and even stony eminences may be met with.”—Schrenck, p. 271, vol. i.

On this dead flat, hardly a tree, except a few miserable pines, is to be observed, though along the banks of the rivers, which lazily wind through the level mossy ground, willows and stunted birch trees, are generally to be found, and are invaluable as providing firewood for the traveller, and as landmarks for the Samojede guides. Over the whole of this waste, the rein deer moss is plentifully distributed, and in no part of Europe are these animals to be found in such numbers. Without the rein deer, the Tundra would be uninhabitable even by the hardy Samojede, for this animal supplies them with almost all the necessaries of life. Fifty years ago, there were Samojedes who possessed herds of many thousand rein deer, but since then, the position of the aboriginal inhabitants of this wilderness has lamentably deteriorated. A powerful and more intelligent race, dwelling on the south of the Petschora, has crossed that great river and invaded the territories of the mild and timid Samojedes; and at the time of Schrenck's visit, had become the real lords of the Tundra. These people are the Syranians, nominally Christian, but worse than the worst heathens in their

dealings with the Samojedes. They unite the craft of the civilized Russian with the unscrupulous avarice and violence of the barbarian. Armed with the fire-water, the surest weapon employed by civilized man for the destruction of the savage, the Syranians have gradually, by pretended debts and obligations, reduced the Samojedes to a condition of absolute slavery. Very few of the latter now possess herds of rein deer, and they are gradually being driven further off into the wildest parts of the Tundra by their conquerors. It was about the beginning of the present century that the Syranians crossed the Petschora into the Tundra.

"Here," says Schrenck, "they began to keep small herds of rein deer, obtaining the friendship of the Samojedes by presents of brandy. Their herds rapidly increased, others followed over the great river, and more active measures were soon adopted to increase their riches. For this purpose, the milder and more upright, if we may use the word, employed the all-powerful talisman of brandy which they sold to the Samojedes at a most usurious price, while the bolder spirits entered the tents of the Samojedes, forced their brandy upon the ever willing savages till they were helplessly intoxicated, and then plundered them of all their goods, and drove off their herds into the Tundra out of the reach of their original owners, changing the marks on the deer, so that they could not be recognized. All this went on unknown to the Russian government, for no employé of the cabinet of St. Petersburg entered the desolate Tundra. Many were the deeds of rapine and murder which never reached the ears of the authorities,—they were deeds done in the solitude of the Tundra, and of which the perpetrators did not choose to speak. Some years after, one of the Syranians at Ischma boasted, when intoxicated, that he had once made drunk with brandy the whole of the inmates of a Samojede tent, nine in number, and then murdering them all in their drunken sleep, had quietly taken possession of all their property. In the short space of thirty years, the Samojedes were dispossessed of the greater Tundra, and their vast herds of rein deer had passed into the hands of their invaders. But less acquainted than the Samojedes with the management of the rein deer, the Syranians now felt the necessity of engaging the former as their shepherds and servants. Not content with the ordinary relation of master and servant, they speedily, by additional supplies of the irresistible brandy, made the Samojedes their debtors, until these timid people submitted to become absolutely their slaves,"—Schrenck, p. 297, vol. i.

Castren's travels through the Tundra were in the winter season, while Schrenck, who was an ardent botanist,

traversed these desolate regions in the summer. Winter travelling, over the unbroken surface of snow, is undoubtedly the easiest mode of traversing the Tundra. Castren does not seem to have met with a tithe of the difficulties encountered by Schrenck, but, on the other hand, we must not forget that the former was hardened by long residence among the Finnish Lapps, and was, moreover, a Finn by birth, while Schrenck was a native of a more southern region. Castren's lively pen sketches admirably the manners, customs, and ordinary life of the Samojedes, while Schrenck enters more deeply into the natural history of this wild region, and where he speaks of the Samojedes, it is chiefly with reference to their oppression by the Syranians, and the miserable condition to which they have been reduced. The greater Tundra was hardly visited by Castren, who continued his journey to Obdorsk, in Siberia, up the stream of the Petschora, but Schrenck spent the autumn between the Oural mountains and Pustosersk. When Castren wished to set out on his long and adventurous journey, he sought to engage at Mesen a Samojede, to act as interpreter and guide. But all his endeavours to obtain a sober Samojede were unavailing; he could not get one man who possessed sufficient self-command to refrain from ardent spirits for twenty-four hours together. At last one was brought to him, a native of the Kanin Nos peninsula, and who was described by his countrymen as the soberest and wisest man in all the Lesser Tundra.

"The man was brought to me, and at first it really seemed as if he would be useful, but after the lapse of a few hours, he wearied of the confinement, and of my reiterated questions, and pretended to be sick. He threw himself down on the floor of the room, and crept weeping and crying to my feet, and begged that I would spare him, until, wearied of the pitiable sight, I drove him from the door. Shortly after, I saw him lying drunk in the snow before the dram shop. He was not the only one of his nation, however, who had sunk under the besetting sin of his race, for the whole open snow-covered space in front of the temple of Bacchus, was dotted with persons of both sexes, fallen worshippers of the jolly god. All of them lay with their faces prone upon the snow, and many had half recovered from their debauch. The stillness of death reigned among these prostrate heroes and heroines, while the wildest cries rang out from the interior of the dram-shop. But there was no fighting, the utmost good humour and good fellowship prevailed. From time to time half-drunken men rushed out from the dram

shop with a coffee pot in their hands, and walked carefully amid the recumbent Samojedes, fearful lest they should spill a drop of the precious liquid, looking diligently on every side to recognize the sleeping forms of a wife, a mother, a bride, or a friend. As soon as they had found the object of their search, they placed the coffee pot on the snow, and turned the sleeper over so as to bring the face uppermost, and then proceeded to apply the coffee pot to her lips, and allowed the precious liquid to trickle down her throat. Then they carefully turned the patient back into her original position, taking care to cover her face carefully with snow lest it should become frost bitten.'—p. 212.

Castren left Mesen on the 19th December, 1842, on his journey into the Tundra, committing himself unhesitatingly to the guidance of the Samojedes. Although these poor people are still, for the most part, heathens, they have yet had, during the last twenty or thirty years, some opportunities of learning the truths of Christianity. The earliest attempt at their conversion, however, do not extend further back than the present generation. In 1822, a Russian priest named Feodor, was sent into the Tundra, and from the favourable report he gave of the disposition of the natives, a regular mission was established by imperial command; and in 1824, the Archimandrite Venjamin, from the Monastery of Siga, was placed in the Tundra with several assistants. The missionary first directed his attention to the lesser Tundra, and made his way to the north east, towards the Kanin promontory, near Sviatoinos. Here he baptized some hundreds of the Samojedes, and burned a considerable number of their clumsy hideous wooden idols. In 1825 and 1826, they passed into the greater Tundra, east of the Petschora. Many of the Samojedes whom they visited, listened to their exhortations, and accepted baptism; but others fled before them and even crossed the Oural Mountains into Siberia, rather than adopt the new doctrines. It soon became evident that their fears were greatly fostered by the Syranians and the Russians, dwelling in the Tundra, and about Pustosersk. They justly feared that their tyranny and misdeeds, among the heathen Samojedes, would now be brought under the cognizance of the Russian authorities; they found that the Christianized Samojede had obtained a protector in the Russian mission, and that they could no longer feed their enslaved herdsmen on the animals they lost by sickness, nor force them to eat meat

during the frequently recurring fasts of the Russian Church. All these reasons induced these abandoned tyrants to side with the heathens, and especially to co-operate with the Tadibés, or magicians, who trembled to lose their influence over this simple people. The schaman, or Tadibé, the medicine man of these wild tribes, differs little from the ordinary magician of the savage nations. Their occupation is chiefly to be present at weddings and other solemn occasions, to assist, by their incantations, in the recovery of lost property, and especially in finding rein deer, the great treasure of the Samojedes, when they had wandered from the tents of their masters. Both Castren and Schrenck, constantly met with these magicians, whose influence however, is gradually waning before the advance of Christianity. By the end of 1830, the Mission could exhibit a list of above three thousand converts in the two Tundra. The countries were now divided into three parishes, churches were built and priests appointed to each of these, with an appropriate salary, while store houses of corn and salt were placed under an inspector at each church to attract around it the population. In 1840, it was calculated that out of the 4500 inhabitants of the Tundra, only 700 or 800 continued openly to profess heathenism, but among the converts, there exists a strange mixture of the old and the new doctrines. Long before they accepted Christianity, the Samojedes had received the Russian Saint, St. Nicholas, among the number of their deities; and when offerings to the latter failed to obtain their desired objects, they would have recourse as a last resource, to the all-powerful patron of the Russian Empire, and would even demand baptism as a means of rendering him more propitious. Thus Schrenck tells us, that while he was at the famous temple or offering-place of the Samojedes, on the peninsula opposite to Waygat's island, a spot very accurately described by the old English navigators, he saw a Samojede of the Haruzi tribe, who had vowed sacrifices to the heathen gods, and also to the holy St. Nicholas. He had already sacrificed to the former on Waygat's Island, and now was on his way to Pustosersk to fulfil the vow he had made for the recovery of his wife from illness, to the great Patron Saint of the Russians, to whom he intended to sacrifice no less than ten of his rein deer. Such a journey, without a change of rein

deer, and in the summer season, across five hundred miles of the greater Tundra, was really, as Schrenck observed, fully equal to the hardships of a pilgrimage in ancient times to the Holy Land. The converted Samojedes, however, have learned little of their new faith beyond the making of the Russian sign of the cross on their breasts. Though they occasionally frequent the Christian churches when in their neighbourhood, they also deem it advisable to propitiate the enemy of mankind; for they say: "If we believe that the God of the Christians can help us, we must believe that the devil of the Christians can injure us, let us therefore propitiate him too by sacrifices!" At the present day, heathenism is almost confined to the free Samojedes of the greater Tundra; almost all those who are in service with the Russians and the Syranians, have become Christians. To a nation that subsists almost entirely on animal food, the long and frequent fasts of the Russian Church will be almost intolerable; and, besides this, the polygamy of the free Samojedes, at least of such as are wealthy, is a powerful incentive to retain them in heathenism. Although not general, polygamy is to be met with among those who still possess large herds of rein deer, and one or two of the wealthiest Samojedes indulge in as many as four wives at once.

Castren gives a lively picture of his reception at a Samojede tent in the wild Tundra. It was the dwelling of a heathen Samojede, the father of the driver of his sledge:

"On my arrival at the tent the owner and his wife both came out. I remained standing by the sledge in order to see what kind of a reception I should meet with. At all events I felt sure of an invitation to enter the tent, but I waited in vain. Both the Samojedes remained quite still, the man gazed earnestly on me with his half-shut winking eyes, while his wife looked hard at her husband with occasional glances towards myself. Their son, my driver, quietly took his rein-deer out of the sledge, and then advancing to his parents saluted them with the Russian word 'Torowa.' Both father and mother answered 'Torowa,' and there was an end of the conversation. I then accosted my silent hosts with the like salutation and received a similar response. Then ensued a long pause, till I broke silence by ordering fresh rein-deer to be put to the sledge. I then went up to the tent and opened the door, but within all was dark as the grave. I asked the hostess to light a fire in the tent, but all in vain. Feeling cautiously about the tent I came at last upon a heap of dry branches, and bearing

them to the hearth soon kindled a blazing fire. By its light I observed the presence of a young Samojede girl in a corner of the tent, where she was busily engaged with a lump of frozen flesh. She used no knife in her repast, but fixed her teeth in the savoury morsel, and bit and tore and shook her head over the meat, till her hair fell in the wildest disorder about her blood-red face. From time to time she cast anxious glances at me, till all at once she dropped the meat, sate up and pushed her hair back from her countenance, while her face beamed with joy. I had taken out my snuff-box, and the sight of the metal had produced this immediate change. Meanwhile the rest of the family entered the tent and placed themselves round the fire in the deepest silence. This was broken at length by a wild cry from the girl, who observed a gold ring on one of my fingers. She questioned me as to its value in case I would sell it." (Castren, p. 240.)

The ceremonies both of marriage and of funerals among this wild people are peculiar. Castren gives a lively picture of a Samojede wedding, which however does not greatly differ from the prevailing customs among better known savage nations. But the feast that followed, or rather the climax of that feast, was barbarous in the extreme.

"After tea our host ordered a magnificent rein-deer to be killed. A slight blow on the forehead with an axe laid the beast prostrate on the ground. A knife was then thrust into its heart, and the windpipe was cut out, and a furious contest ensued for this delicate morsel. It was at length decided that it should be cut into strips and distributed to the nearest relatives of the new married pair. The deer was then skinned, the belly cut open, and a portion of the intestines removed, and the animal was then placed upon its back. It then resembled a huge oval bowl, in which the lungs, the liver, and other choice morsels, swam in a sea of blood. The guests crowded around, drawing their long knives, and cut off portions of the yet warm and reeking flesh, dipped them in the blood and conveyed them to their mouths. Here, seizing the savoury morsel in their teeth, they cut off a portion of it close to their lips. The blood ran down their faces and their necks, and, as a dessert, they devoured the lungs and the liver after the same fashion." (p. 256.)

At a similar feast Schrenck observed that after the conclusion of the meal a bundle of shavings was handed round upon which the guests wiped their hands and faces.

The Samojede lives almost entirely on flesh or fish, of which latter the great Petschora river supplies an immense variety. Whether its sandy banks would present attractions to the salmon fisher, for the river swarms with several

species of this noble fish, we have considerable doubts; the want of fall in the course of the Petschora will not allow of those rapids rushing into deep stony pools which delight the eye of the veteran angler. Even if it were possible to kill salmon with the rod on the Petschora or its tributaries, the distance of the journey would intimidate our boldest anglers, for to reach the Petschora when the ice breaks up at the end of May, it would be necessary to leave St. Petersburg in the middle of March.

Besides the flesh of the rein-deer the Samojeedes kill thousands of geese during the period of moulting, when the birds cannot fly. Schrenck has given an admirable description of these singular wild goose hunts, as observed by him on the Kolwa, a tributary of the Petschora, flowing out of the greater Tundra. On his journey down this river he frequently fell in with large flocks of wild geese undergoing the moulting process, and consequently unable to escape by taking wing. On observing the boat the birds swam to the shore, and if followed betook themselves to the land, running at great speed over the banks, where, however, they were soon overtaken by the boatmen and knocked down with sticks. If there were bushes on the banks they frequently escaped pursuit by hiding, but not unfrequently the stupid birds contented themselves (as is fabled of the ostrich) with merely hiding their heads in the foliage, leaving their bodies uncovered. The goose hunts take place annually between the first and twentieth of July upon the Kolwa and neighbouring rivers.

“Three or four hunters, accompanied by dogs, proceed in a boat up the river nearly to its source before commencing operations. During the moulting season the geese generally congregate about the rivers for the purpose of more easily procuring food, and they are generally to be found on the banks in flocks of six to twelve individuals. Upon the approach of men they either take to the water or to the banks for concealment. The boat, with one or two of the hunters, is floated slowly down the river, while the others with the dogs drive the geese from the banks into the water, where, believing themselves in safety, they float slowly down the current. The boat follows at a distance, keeping the ever increasing flock in sight, while the dogs, which are well trained to their work, carefully prevent the geese from returning to either bank. If, on their downward journey, the hunters come to a tributary stream, on the banks of which more of the game is likely to be found, they follow it up for a certain distance, and drive the geese down from its

banks to the main river, where the affrighted new comers hasten to join the main flock, and the whole proceed further down before the boat. As, however, the continuous journey, which often lasts for several days, would be too arduous for the hunters, and as the geese, by continual driving and anxiety might lose some of their condition, the voyage is so arranged that they reach about nightfall some low grassy spot. On arriving here the boats, dogs, and men, draw off out of sight, and the hungry weary geese instantly betake themselves to feed, and afterwards, without wandering, seek repose upon the spot, as they believe themselves no longer pursued. Meanwhile the hunters too have taken their night's repose, and with the early morning they again surround the resting-place and drive the geese into the water, when the boat again follows at a distance and the dogs resume their active vigilance. Thus the 'drive' continues day by day, the flock of geese receiving fresh augmentations in its progress down the river, till it arrives near the mouth of the stream, where due preparations have been made for the capture of the birds. For this purpose the hunters make choice of a portion of the river where the banks on either side are high and perpendicular, with a narrow strip of flat land between the cliffs and the water. While the other hunters have been up the river on the 'drive,' those who remain below make, on one of the sides of the stream, a circular enclosure surrounded by nets and stakes, and with a single small opening looking up the river. This aperture in the stake-net is about two or three feet from the ground, and access to it is gained by two or three boards which form an inclined plane up to it, and are covered with grass and turf. These boards extend from the flat bank into the opening, and, at the edge of the latter, are laid down a quantity of flexible willow rods, which give way as soon as they are trod upon and precipitate the geese into the enclosure. On the one side of the opening, nets are stretched to the base of the cliffs, on the other they extend for some distance into the river. Having completed his preparations, the hunter withdraws on the approach of the flock, to some little distance down the river, where he conceals himself in the bushes, and when the geese come in sight, he stretches out a long white rod before the astonished birds. As the boat is behind, and the white wand indicates danger in front, the timid birds betake themselves to the low shelving shore beneath the cliffs, and on that side on which the nets are placed, as the dogs and men now begin to appear on the opposite bank. The perpendicular cliffs prevent their escaping directly into the forest, and the geese run along their base till they come to the nets. Soon the aperture leading into the enclosed stake net is perceived, one or two of the leading birds eagerly avail themselves of it, they dart in, and falling through the bending willow rods into the enclosure, are lost to the sight of their companions. These, of course, follow eagerly, and the whole flock, often consisting of 1500

or 2000 birds, is soon within the net, and is speedily disposed of by the hunters."—(p. 267).

Among wild animals, the bear is the most frequent and most dreaded inhabitant of the Samojede Tundra. On the northern coast, the white or Polar bear is by no means uncommon, and both species are regarded with dread, and, like the devil of the Christians, are worshipped or propitiated to avert danger from their ravages. Occasionally, the brown bear, when pressed by hunger, makes his way into the tents of the Samojedes,—and there are instances where the animal has destroyed the whole of the inmates. While the church on the Kolwa river was being built, bears were very plentiful and troublesome in the vicinity, and the Russian priest there informed Schrenck, that a year or two before, a bear had visited the tent of an old Samojede, who was much distressed on his return that he had not been at home to receive his grisly visitor. The Samojede, like the Finn, is not afraid to encounter the bear in single combat, armed with his long spear, or even with his knife alone, and not unfrequently he comes off victorious in the contest. On the Kolwa, the bear is fond of rein deer flesh, and will even attack man, but there is no instance known of horned cattle, which have been lately introduced there, having been attacked by these animals. In other countries, where they are not of such recent importation, horned cattle do not escape the ravages of the bear. When a Samojede hunter shoots a bear, he never boasts of his exploit, for fear of the vengeance of the spirit of the dead animal, but he carefully conceals his prize. There is no greater harbinger of evil than the accidentally treading on a portion of bear's fur. Their most solemn oaths are taken by cutting an incision with a knife in a piece of bear skin; and there are very few instances on record of so solemn an obligation having been disregarded. Can it be true, as Schrenck assures us is the case, that the few individuals who have broken this oath, have actually perished by being eaten by bears?

Although the Samojede cannot resist the temptations of ardent spirits, he yet looks upon intemperance as a crime, and they even call the Christian Sunday, Sin-day, as the Russians and converted Samojedes too often spend that day in intemperance and rioting. One of the few remaining holy places of the heathen Samojedes was visited by Schrenck. It is perhaps the last heathen temple existing

in Europe, and seems almost unchanged since it was visited and described by Stephen Burrough, in 1556. It is situated at the Bolvanskoi Noss, on Waigat's Island. It is, however, no temple built with stones by the hand of man, but a perforation in the cliffs caused by the ceaseless action of the waves. Where this perforation, which extends from the coast inland, reaches the sea, a narrow platform and space exist directly overhanging the waves, and this wild spot has been for ages the sacred temple of the old Samojede gods. In 1824, the Russian Mission first reached this spot. Many of the heathen Samojedes had fled before it, some crossing the desert into Siberia, while others took refuge on the northern side of Waigat's Island. The missionaries did their best to destroy the reputed sanctity of the place. They burned the images of the gods, rude figures cut in wooden stakes to the image of a man, and planted the cross directly over the old site of the temple. But difficulties arose in their progress; the heathen Samojedes refused to supply them with rein deer, and they soon found themselves obliged to leave the spot, and betake themselves further south. On their departure, the heathen natives returned, and restored, as far as in their power, the images of their gods, which no missionary has since disturbed. The cross of the Christian still stands upon the wild promontory, but the wildest pagan rites are celebrated in its immediate vicinity. Schrenck found the idols of the Samojedes ranged there in groups, and consisting of stakes of wood three or four feet in height, on which were cut the rudest possible images of the human face. The mouths of these idols were besmeared with the blood of the sacrifices, the skulls, antlers, and hoofs of the sacrificed rein deer, were piled up around them, but all the other bones had been carefully removed.

The bones of the great primæval inhabitants of this Arctic Zone, the Arctic elephant and the mammoth, are but rarely found on the European side of the Oural Mountains. The Samojedes denominate them the bones of the "subterranean rein deer," a gigantic beast, which has its "runs" and passages beneath the earth, and which rarely appears above ground at the present day. If they find any of the bones or tusks, they are unwilling to touch them, and prefer to indicate their locality for a small reward to the Russians or Syranians of the Tundra, who are deterred

by no scruples from appropriating the precious ivory. The greater part of this ivory is transported down the Pinega to Holmogory, and Archangel, where it is manufactured by natives and untaught artists, into the most beautiful caskets and other articles of luxury, which are sold at high prices in St. Petersburg. The Samojede woman, as in most barbarous nations, is kept in a state of abject slavery. She dares not eat with her lord and master, she must avoid certain parts of the tent, her whole life is as laborious as that of an Indian squaw. Rude, however, as the Samojede undoubtedly is, there are occasional examples among the heathen natives of a charity and generosity that might be sought for in vain among the Russians and Syranians of the district.

"Our host, a heathen Samojede," says Schrenck, "entertained us with the history of his life and adventures, the principal details of which would apply to many of his unfortunate race. He was formerly a wealthy nomade Samojede, for he possessed a herd of 1500 rein deer; but when the Syranians crossed the Pëtschora, and spread themselves over the Tundra, and effected the ruin of all the Samojedes with whom they came in contact, his tents became a refuge for his impoverished countrymen, who came to seek, at the hands of their wealthy neighbour, that assistance which the Samojede never refuses when it is in his power. Gradually, by his lavish gifts to his starving neighbours, he became so reduced in circumstances, that he now did not own more than thirty rein deer. By withdrawing in the summer to the Island of Warandei, in the Frozen Sea, he had escaped the overt acts of robbery committed by the Syranians; but on this isle, he fell into the hands of the Russian merchants, who annually visit it for purposes of trade, and who, by the aid of brandy, succeeded in depriving him of almost all his remaining possessions. Yet still this poor fellow had actually just returned from Pustosersk, where he had been providing both provisions and money for some orphans of Russian parents, not, as he said, out of love for that nation, for he hated them with his whole heart, but to do honour to the Russian God!"—(p. 516).

The medical knowledge of the Samojede conjurors is on a par with their savage religious ceremonies. A favourite idea among the natives, when they are afflicted with any internal malady, is, that a worm has located itself in the part where pain is felt, and is slowly destroying the interior organs. The conjuror, after many magic ceremonies, proceeds to make an incision in the skin, and to extract the worm, availing himself of a large earth-worm concealed

in the ample sleeve of his "malizia," to impose on the wondering bystanders. Directly that the cut is made, he pretends to pluck forth the worm, casts it on the ground, divides it into two parts with a stroke of his knife, and instantly devours the one half, while the other moiety is burnt or buried with additional ceremonies. After a summer spent in the wild wastes of the greater Tundra, where the lakes were often frozen, even in the month of August, Schrenck returned to Pustosersk on the Petschora, in autumn. This town was formerly of much greater magnitude; it now consists of only about forty families, but it contains no less than four churches, though two of these are very old and almost in a ruinous condition. Most of the inhabitants, too, adhere to what is called the old Russian party in ecclesiastical matters, and therefore refuse to frequent the modern Russian service, contenting themselves with meeting privately for prayer. The Russian government has here also erected magazines of salt and flour, and it would be well if no other article were sold therein. Unfortunately, the demand for brandy far exceeds that for bread among the Samojedes, and many thousand gallons of spirits are annually here consumed, to the utter ruin of the poor natives.

From Pustosersk, Schrenck pursued his homeward journey along the northern coast of the lesser Tundra. The limits of the forest vegetation, towards the north, have receded considerably during the present century. According to the account of the inhabitants, the pines all perished by the tremendous frost of the year in which the French were in Russia (1812). On the Indega river, the pines were entirely destroyed, but whole woods of dead trees were still standing. The Russian householder, on the banks of the Indega, was surrounded with many of the comforts of civilization, he possessed a herd of above a thousand rein deer, and made large profits from the sea coast, which supplied his hunters with walrus and seals. The Greenland seal, the great object of chase further to the east, rarely appears at the mouth of the Indega, but the walrus and the common seal, come in June with the drift ice. To obtain these animals when lying on the ice, the hunters make use of a white wooden screen which they push before them till they arrive within shot. The white "fish," (beluga) appears in flocks of 50 or 60 individuals off the mouth of the river, in June or July, and ascends

the stream with the tide. From the look-out stations, established on the river, the advance of the flock is telegraphed higher up the stream, and boats put off to turn the "fish" down towards the sea. Here, however, their retreat is cut off by another fleet of boats, which drive the flock towards the shallow sand banks of the river, and gradually enclose it in a huge net of 700 fathoms long, and about two fathoms in depth, which is stretched between two of the longest boats. The net is made of rope of the thickness of the finger, and the meshes are more than a foot in diameter. As the tide falls, the "fish" touch the ground, and are gradually enclosed in the net, when they are killed with lances and dragged on to the land before the tide again covers the sand banks. The excitement of these chases is great, but it is far inferior to the whale hunts in the Feroe and Shetland isles, where a somewhat similar fish, the *delphinus deductor*, is driven on shore out of deep water on to the sandy terminations of the bays. As many as a thousand of these "fish" have been captured at one drive in Shetland. They are about fifteen or twenty feet in length, and are worth, on the average, about fifty shillings each to the fortunate captors.

Eastward of the Petschora, the pursuit of the Greenland seal on the drift ice, that sets in from the Polar regions, is one of the main occupations of the inhabitants of *Mesen* in the spring months. The seals herd together on the drift ice in enormous numbers at this period of the year, but the drift ice is ever moving, and after remaining for a few tides off the coast, it floats away to the north east, towards the coast of *Nova Zembla*. Besides the terrific hardships endured by the hunters from the intense cold, and the difficulty of making their way over the ice hummocks, difficulties so feelingly spoken of by every Arctic voyager, there is ever a danger that storms may arise, and may hurry the drift ice on which they have taken up their position, out into the Frozen Sea. Every year lives are lost in this hazardous occupation, and even in the best of seasons, the gain is comparatively small, but the excitement of the chase ever enlists fresh hunters, though it is complained that the number of the seals is annually diminishing.

We have not, in our brief notice of these countries, touched upon the Flora or the geology of the Tundras.

The former as may well be imagined in so northern a region, where snow covers the ground for nine months in the year, is scanty enough, and the position of the strata has been but imperfectly examined, though a good deal of attention has recently been paid to it by European geologists. We trust we have extracted enough from the volumes before us to shew, that though wild and savage in the extreme, the Tundras and their inhabitants are not wholly devoid of interest. As the last heathen race in Europe, the Samojedes are worthy of our attention ; as an oppressed and wronged nation, groaning under the tyranny of the invading Syranians, this mild and timid people has a claim upon our sympathy.

ART. III.—1. *The Catholic Case Stated.* By a Catholic Layman. Dublin : John Mullany, 1 Parliament Street.

2. *Six Letters to a Cabinet Minister on the Education Crisis in Ireland.* By James W. Kavanagh, Esq. Published by the Catholic Book-selling and Publishing Company, 61, New Bond Street, London.

3. *The Board of Education*, and its present assailant, and late Panegyrist, the Author of the "Catholic Case Stated." Alexander Thom and Sons, Dublin, 87 and 8, Abbey Street.

4. *A Reply to a book called "The Catholic Case Stated,"* with a postscript. Dublin : McGlashan and Gill, 50, Upper Sackville Street.

5. *A Letter to the Right Honourable Alexander Macdonnell.* By the Rev. E. A. Stopford, Archdeacon of Meath.

6. *Mixed Education.* "The Catholic Case" and its Catholic advocate vindicated. Dublin : John Mullany, 1, Parliament Street.

7. *Pastoral Address of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops to the Catholic Clergy and People of Ireland.* Dublin : James Duffy, 7, Wellington Quay.

8. *Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners of National Education.* Dublin : Alex. Thom and Sons, 87, Abbey Street.

9. *A Digest of the Evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Lords* appointed to enquire into the working of the National System of Education in Ireland. By the Rev. W.

- le Poer Trench, D. D. Dublin : W. Curry, 9, Upper Sackville Street.
10. *Education the work of the People. A Letter to Lord John Russell.* By W. J. Unwin, M. A., Principal of Homerton College. London: Ward and Co., 27, Paternoster Row.
11. *The Advantages of the Secular System.* By a Clergyman of the diocese of Meath. Dublin : McGlashan and Gill.
12. *State Rationalism in Education.* By the Rev. Henry Formby. Dublin : J. Duffy, Wellington Quay.
13. *Lectures on National Education.—Has the Church or the State the power to Educate the Nation?* By the Rev. F. D. Maurice. London : Rivington, and Darton and Clark, Holborn Hill.

THE great question of modern times is confessedly that of education. Both in Catholic and in Protestant countries, it is a battle-field, every inch of which has been hotly disputed by contending powers. Everywhere the State has, at one time or other, endeavoured to take this matter into its own hands; urged forward, in some instances, by an undue desire to enlarge its influence, in others by a loyal desire to discharge its duties and enlighten its people. We are perhaps too apt, owing to the lessons taught by the experience of recent times, to forget that not very many years ago, the most large-minded statesman, one with no erastian leanings, and no desire to extend the civil sceptre over that region which belongs, in at least as large a measure to the Church, and to the family, as to the State, might easily have gone beyond his limit in this matter. No one had a deeper conviction than Wordsworth, the poet, that it is from the root of spiritual things that everything noble and honorable in a nation grows up; yet in his great poem, "the Excursion," he sighs for those golden days when the State shall recognise her high mission, "Binding herself by Statute" to bestow upon each of her children the instruction he needs. Doubtless, however, the problem on the solution of which he felt that so much depended was not that of the State versus the Church, but the State versus a huge undigested mass of ignorance and barbarism. Few deep thinkers would now commit themselves to the approval of such schemes of State education, nay, of compulsory education, as Prussia at one time adopted, and at last found it necessary to discard, in

favour of one founded more on the solid basis of religion and liberty.

On this, as on other subjects, the nineteenth century has been a period of intellectual growth. Theories which, even when they combated the materialism of the eighteenth century, were yet themselves but a finer growth out of that rank deposit, have given place to principles more philosophical. In the earlier part of this century, State Education was asserted with a cynical nakedness. A man who was great enough to overcome all dangers except those which were occasioned by his own unbridled self-will, has left on record the briefest and most distinct confutation of the system which he had himself established, simply by explaining his motives. It is thus that Napoleon the First describes his educational system, "Mon but principal dans l'établissement d'un corps enseignant est d'avoir un moyen *de diriger les opinions politiques et morales* (Dictionnaire Napoleon, p. 177). An attempt more fatal to the virtue, the religion, the moral being, and ultimately, to the political well-being of a nation could not be described in so few words. It was probably from less enterprising motives—from the love of centralization, and from jealousy of ecclesiastical influence—that Louis Philippe, during the whole of his reign, waged a barren war against that religious education which alone could have expelled the virus of infidelity left behind by the first French Revolution. He triumphed, and, to his ruin, nothing contributed more than that triumph. No solid foundation for a permanent order of things had been laid; and a rising in the metropolis was sufficient to upset the most wary but not the wisest, of European monarchs. But the warning had not been thrown away. The Republic, under the Presidentship of the present Emperor, conceded the great question of freedom in education, for which M. de Montalembert had so long contended, as he restored to the Church its synodical functions; and a religious education has been the result. It was time for sovereigns to unbind the only power that could sustain order, and to discard the policy of the Irishman who sawed off the branch on which he was sitting. The "derniere analyse" of education dissociated from faith, is well illustrated in the following passage of a *Letter to the Right Hon. S. H. Walpole, M. P.*, by J. C. Colquhoun, Esq.—"In the broad glare of

the revolutionary history of 1848, in that chaos of confusion, delusion, and dreams, where socialist raved, and the infidel and mob plundered, the leaders were the schoolmasters, and their scholars the masses." Education must ever be one of the greatest dangers to a nation, if it be not one of the greatest benefits. Long since Edmund Burke defined Jacobinism to be the insurrection of the talents of a country against its property.

Among our own statesmen the advance has been in the same direction. Few English statesmen would now undertake what the purest patriotism and philanthropy might have induced them to attempt in the beginning of the century. The progress made on this subject is curiously illustrated by the great debate on Education in June, 1839. The measure introduced by the liberal government of that day was by no means of an extreme character. The government distinctly stated that what they objected to was only the claim of the Established Church to educate the children of dissenting Bodies. "My opinion," said one of their chiefs, "is, that the education of the children of the church should be given to the church; and let any man in this house, or elsewhere, oppose that principle, and I will be the man to support it." And yet their measure was most vigorously opposed. A noble lord who led that opposition went straight to the middle ages for his principles, and quoted from the laws of Henry the Fourth's time, which affirmed that "*La doctrine et information des enfans est chose spirituelle.*" Clearly and strongly he asserted that religion is the soul of education, and that the ministers of religion should therefore have the chief part in it. "Religion, then, is not a thing apart from education, but is interwoven with its whole system, and is a principle which controls and regulates the whole mind and happiness of the people." (Mirror of Parliament for 1839.) Who was the man to lift up this religious banner? The Earl of Derby—the same individual who some eight years previously had introduced the system of national education into Ireland. That system, though it had made considerable provision for religion, was far from coming up to the elevated standard of Lord Derby's opinions in 1839. Many of the other speeches delivered on this occasion evince a similar progress, especially those of Sir Robert Peel, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Gladstone. It is true that there were

circumstances which made a considerable difference between the case of Irish and English education ; but this alone will not account for the changed tone of public men. The minds of statesmen had not remained stationary while the mind of all Europe had been making progress. That progress has been continued to our own day. In every country, but pre-eminently in conservative Austria, where the emperor has lately given entire educational freedom to his Protestant subjects—thus extending to them, as he had promised, that liberty which in his Concordat he bestowed upon the Catholic Church—has the State been renouncing, at once to its honour and for its signal benefit, exaggerated pretensions. After a protracted struggle the principles of liberty and of religion have made their ground good in England, and in nearly every English dependency. Those principles are not, we believe, necessarily limited to any one particular system ; but they have already given us thoroughly Catholic Schools, supported by public funds, in our North American Colonies, in Malta, and in Australia. We have also the chartered and endowed Catholic Universities of Sydney and of Quebec. In several of the Australian Colonies, and several of the West Indian Islands, the Mixed System has quite recently been found a failure, (as it generally will where not most carefully conducted ;) and the Denominational one is, as we hear, every day superseding it.

What part is Ireland to take in this matter ? Is she to share the general progress ? To discuss that question would be premature until we hear more respecting the answer given by the government to the demand of the bishops. So far as report goes, the expressions used by the government are understood to include a promise to return to the original principles on which the national system was founded. In pointing out what those principles were, how far the present system has drifted from them, and how much would be implied by an engagement to return to them, we shall be contributing to the cause of peace, and no less, so far as our present information permits us, to that of sound Catholic education. A later period will be more suitable for the discussion of abstract principles. We have our own bias on that subject, and shall not endeavour to conceal it ; but on the other hand, we fully admit that the deepest principles may be modified in their application, according to the exigency of circum-

stances, and that there may often exist an honorable and expedient as well as a dishonorable and dangerous compromise. Ireland must remember that the less influence she allows to the State in education, the less assistance she must be prepared to receive. If she demands complete educational liberty she demands "a great work." This is not by necessity any disadvantage; on the contrary, the noblest and most fruitful lesson a nation can learn is that of self-dependence; and no education is sound which does not tend to teach this lesson. In England the State claims little authority in education. It recognizes the principle that the function of the State is to *promote* education, and, so far as its secular element is concerned, to *direct* it, but by no means, itself, to *educate*. It knows that for the State to be a nation's educator is a pretension as extreme as if it were to set itself up as a nation's chief minstrel or philosopher. It knows that, religiously considered, such a system belongs essentially to pagan times, when the gods were national, and creeds of no moment; when the State was itself the church, worship one of its functions, and the "mother city," with its templed acropolis, the only Sion. It knows that all this has been changed by a Christian order of things, which brings us into contact with supernatural Truths as certain, and to Faith as definite, as the phenomena of outward nature,—Truths essential to salvation, and yet for the discernment of which the State cannot believe itself invested with any special faculty. It knows that Christianity has also changed this order of things by its exaltation of the Family, a thing too great to be servile to the State in spiritual relations, and which ever finds the true vindicator of its liberty in the Church, itself the family of God, and the household of faith. The State claims, therefore, little authority in England; but, on the other hand, it gives comparatively little aid; and yet even that measure of assistance is condemned by the "voluntary" school, as deeply injurious to individual exertion; and to a high estimate of education. We shall confine ourselves for the present to a humbler department of this great subject. Whether Ireland is, or is not, to make progress as to the character of her education, depends on the degree in which she is prepared to make sacrifices, and the degree in which those sacrifices, as ennobling as arduous, may be forced upon her. Our present theme is that, at all events,

Ireland ought not to retrograde in educational principles, and that she is in danger of doing so.

Before entering upon this subject we must protest in the strongest terms against the tendency which in some quarters has been shown, to give to the discussion not only a party character, but a character of the most exasperated violence. It is hardly worth while to notice the excesses of isolated individuals at either side ; but the general tone of the English press, with reference to the recent movement in Ireland, has been that of the coarsest abuse, and most unwarrantable imputation of motives. A Pastoral, solemnly issued by the whole Hierarchy of Ireland assembled in synod, and treating with gravity and dignity a most momentous subject, and one respecting which the clergy are confessedly called on to interest themselves, has been treated almost as if it had been a treasonable manifesto. This is extremely stupid ; for no one can imagine that a Hierarchy which has stood the storms of fourteen centuries is likely to be intimidated by newspaper blustering, or that the devotion so long felt to it by a faithful people, and cemented by so many a fiery trial, can be otherwise than increased by undeserved insults. The Irish are not such fools as to discard their proved friends in a vain endeavour to propitiate enemies whom servility can only render more unreasoning and oppressive. Plain facts are the best answer to fiction. The bishops have been accused of a desire to suppress education. But their words are as strong as words can be in the opposite sense. They say, " We have not been without knowing that in a country such as ours, where the educated man, from the lowest to the highest, is sure to leave all others far behind him on the road to wealth or distinction ; where the son of the humblest man in the community may, by his intellectual superiority, rise to the highest office attainable by a subject ; and where the artizan, with only the hands and the head that God gave him, may realize a fortune and win fame—we have not been without knowing that in such a country the people must be educated ; and we may appeal to our Catholic schools, colleges, and our Catholic university, erected out of very scanty resources, as evidence of the sincerity of our desire for the diffusion of sound and useful education." They have next been accused of a tyrannical desire to get into their own hands all the educational institutes of the country. But it is

self-evident that the system for which they have avowed a preference is, on the contrary, one which would prevent the possibility of such a tyranny, since its fundamental principle is that each denomination is to have the charge of its own affairs. They have, in the third place, been accused of a desire to exclude the State from all influence in education. Has the State then no influence in those English schools which it inspects, and in which salaries and other pecuniary advantages are awarded exclusively according to the reports of its inspectors? Again and again the strongest advocates of the denominational system have expressed their conviction that the secular part of education belongs mainly to the State; that very great advantage results from State interference in this matter, and that the clergy are responsible only for the religious department of education. We rejoice to be able to believe that whatever have been the extravagances of a large portion of the press on this subject, the more thoughtful statesmen of England are not disposed to countenance them. They do not think that principles for which in England Dissenters have contended, as well as members of the Established Church, and laymen, if possible, with more enthusiasm than clergymen, can be recommended to Catholic bishops in Ireland only by a selfish love of power or by foreign sympathies. It was reserved for a Catholic, on a recent occasion at Cork, to bring some such charge against the prelates of his own Church in the presence of statesmen and courtiers, who may have heard it with pleasure, but hardly with respect for the speaker, and certainly with surprise. If the report of the speech to which we allude was incorrect, we trust that it has been long since disavowed. If it be avowed the Queen's colleges have suffered a wound severer than any other argument could have inflicted. A significant illustration has been exhibited of their influence on a Catholic mind.

Before quitting this part of our subject we shall quote from a Protestant sermon a passage, the eloquence of which cannot fail to delight our readers; while our Protestant friends, when they contrast the enthusiasm which doubtless greeted it, with the vituperation poured forth upon Catholic prelates, whose language has been of a far more moderate character, will not fail to be reminded of a certain old adage about the man who steals the horse, and the man who looks over the hedge. Our extract does not

relate to the Established Church of England. That Church boasts "a little sister at home," originally planted in this country for missionary purposes yet unfulfilled. In setting forth her claims High Church enthusiasm generally grows constrained, for she is commonly regarded as a standing confutation of High Church principles. The following passage is from a sermon preached in favour of the Irish "Church Education Society," by the late lamented William Archer Butler, well known both as a poet and as a learned and eloquent professor. In its special application, the light which it sheds is doubtless that of the

"Eye that gildeth all on which it gazeth ;"

but we think that no Catholic can read it without fancying for it a different application, and resolving that his Church shall at least never be the mere drudge of a State that does not pretend to respect her.

"For this purpose it was, as we affirm, that Christ Himself appointed a successive ministry, and that the apostles under His guidance began the permanent location of that ministry in the various districts of the converted world : that is, began the Diocesan and Parochial system which we inherit. We farther maintain, that from the nature and objects of such a body, it plainly shows that their authority of Spiritual Superintendence extends equally over every period of life ; the obligation becoming only more urgent in proportion to the importance of the period on the general formation of the moral character. The circumstances of its fulfilment may vary, the principle of the obligation is unchangeable : and whether in the pulpit, the sick room, the cottage, parlour, or the school, the minister of Christ is equally doing what he cannot, without a crime, neglect, what no man, without a crime, can hinder his doing. The direction of moral education is as much involved in the ministerial commission, as the office of preaching ; and in point of fact, the minister of Christ is not more impressively warned to *preach* the truth in public exposition than he is to *teach* it in every other practicable form.

* * * * *

"Yes, the Church, for in this, as I began so must I end my argument—the Church is the fitting educator of the people. From that hour of feebleness, when she receives the infant at the font, and blesses it in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to that hour of as helpless feebleness, when she feeds the parting spirit with the Bread of Life, and the promise of immortality—from the first to the last hour of human existence—the Church is the instructor, the consoler, the friend of her people.

* * * * *

"Her right is derived from a source beyond earth, it cannot without a crime be surrendered. Her commission is from the skies ; it cannot be superseded by the self-constituted emissaries of self constituted associations. *We* are the ordained and entrusted teachers of the people ; the charter is from Christ, and through Christ from the throne of God. Schemes of instruction, projects of enlightenment, arise and flourish and die ; alone immortal and impassable, the Church of Christ has lived a life of centuries ; and shows no symptoms of decrepitude yet. The corruptions of her earthly scene (for she is yet but militant) have often darkened her with their gloomiest shadow, but no earthly power shall ever pierce a vital part. The body of Christ is immortal as its immortal Head ! And if you would know what is the essence of all legitimate 'National Education' in the eye of Him who is the Lord of Nations, read it in the promise in which, commissioning her to be the instructress of the people, Christ, ere he passed to heaven, breathed into her frame the breath of imperishable life, 'Go ye and teach all nations.....and lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world.'"

We shall not endeavour to emulate this spirit-stirring appeal. Our present theme is humbler. It is not the denominational system, versus the "mixed," but the "mixed" system, as it now stands, versus that which was originally introduced in 1831. For the statesmen who introduced that system we entertain the highest respect. Several of them during a long series of years had fought, side by side with us, the great battle of Catholic Emancipation, and had made political sacrifices for it, although to others was accidentally awarded the glory of carrying that great measure. The opponents of that system were the opponents of everything liberal or just that had been done in Ireland. Possibly no measure founded on more perfect principles could then have been carried. Although not without drawbacks, that system has during more than a quarter of a century conferred many great benefits on Ireland. It was chiefly opposed during its earlier period by those who wished to subvert the Catholic Faith : in many places it has actually assisted the poor in resisting proselytism, although, like the fountain of old which kindled an unlighted torch, but extinguished a lighted one, its tendency in other places may have been of an opposite character. We are grateful to those who planned it ; and we trust that the present Government will not deprive itself of a like tribute of gratitude, by rejecting their example and sustaining proved abuses in preference to

the measure of 1831. As regards the Board also our desire is to say nothing that can be painful to any of its members or ex-members. Lest we should be betrayed into doing so unwittingly we begin by stating expressly that to none of them do we impute any unworthy motive or conscious desire to make the system swerve from that impartiality which it at first maintained, and still professes. We attribute to none of them more than that unconscious bias from which no one with much self-knowledge can believe himself wholly exempt, and to which public Boards are sometimes more subject than individuals. There have been Catholics as well as Protestants at the Board; and as several of them appear not to have perceived what was likely to be the joint effect of changes made at various successive times, it would be unreasonable to expect a keener insight, relatively to Catholic interests, on the part of their coadjutors. The system from the time it came into practical operation included, unfortunately, two sources of danger. In its constitution there was a predominance of that influence which is represented by the State: and in its administration there was a predominance, both official and intellectual, of Protestant influence; Protestants far outnumbering Catholics at the Board and in the chief departments, and being almost exclusively charged with the composition of the school books.* The line in which the system has moved is a diagonal between these two forces, neither of which is favourable to Catholicism. The development in favour of non-vested schools was, so far a diminution of State influence; but in the south it did us, religiously, no good, though it may have injured other Persuasions, and in the north it did us very grievous harm. The Model schools, on the other hand, do not necessarily expose us to any direct danger of proselytism; but they are the most exaggerated form in which the State can come forward as an educator; and they are consequently injurious to all religious influences, whether Catholic or Protestant.

No statement can be more untrue than the assertion that the Catholic prelates are now for the first time awake to the changed character of the National system. Again and

* This circumstance, though unfortunate, is not to be attributed to any unfair intention. On the contrary a Catholic was originally directed to compose several of the books.

again they have protested. The protest was now that of an individual prelate, now that of a provincial synod, and now that of a national synod; but, with a few trivial exceptions, those protests have been always in vain. Particular cases of abuse have been set straight; but the system has pursued the tenour of its way notwithstanding, impelled by that iron logic against which individuals may rebel, but which institutes and communities slowly but surely obey. Chapter xvi. in the "*Catholic Case Stated*," gives an unanswerable historic narrative of the efforts made by the Catholic prelates, and their ill success. Several of the present rules were indeed condemned by anticipation in the "*Resolutions of the Four Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland*, passed at their meeting in 1826," when a plan of education, under the auspices of Government, was submitted to them. These resolutions were passed before Catholic Emancipation had been carried, and, nevertheless, the note which they sound is clear and bold. The principle of "mixed education" the prelates by no means approve as such, but the practice may, they say, "*under existing circumstances*, be allowed, provided sufficient care be taken to protect the religion of the Roman Catholic children, and to furnish them with adequate means of religious instruction." (*Catholic Case Stated*, p. 407.)

To ensure these conditions they proceed to require

"That where Catholic pupils are a majority the head teacher shall be a Catholic, where a minority, that there should be a Catholic assistant; that the Catholic Bishop of the diocese should have either the nomination, or else the express approval of Catholic teachers, who should be removed upon his representation. The Resolutions affirm that there should be separate training schools for Catholic teachers, the staff in which should be exclusively Catholic; that all the religious books to be used in schools should be either selected or approved by the Bishops, and that they should have power to exclude from use in the schools all books of a secular kind to which they might object on religious grounds. On passing these important Resolutions in 1826, the Catholic clergy rapidly withdrew from connection with the Kildare Place Society, and the active and general opposition thus stimulated soon overthrew that body." (*Ibid.* p. 370.)

In the year 1840, the Catholic Hierarchy having long been divided on the subject of national education, a committee consisting of three prelates favourable to that

system, and three unfavourable, was appointed for the purpose of suggesting an arrangement calculated to produce unanimity. After much discussion the primate, Dr. Crolly, drew up six resolutions, which were unanimously adopted by the prelates and submitted to the Lord Lieutenant. These Resolutions re-affirmed most of the principles asserted in 1826, and made several suggestions besides, in harmony with them. The Lord Lieutenant refused every one of these requests without exception—the Presbyterian body having only a month previously “obtained the removal of the main objection which had prevented them from joining the national system.”

In 1847 the bishops passed a resolution condemning a recent change by which the Board required that all schools to the building of which they had contributed should be vested in them. This resolution produced no effect; but in the next month “Archdeacon Stopford submitted to the National Board his application for aid to his schools in Kells, and in November, 1847, the order of the Board was passed, which removed the last remaining of Lord Stanley’s defences against proselytism in national schools.” (p. 276.) In 1850 the Synod of Thurles was held. The Queen’s Colleges had specially attracted attention to the importance of sound principles in education. As to the National system, the Synod, while it declared that “the separate education of Catholic youth is in every way to be preferred to it,” made suggestions for the purpose of rendering that system “as little dangerous as possible,” especially adverting to the advice given by the Papal Rescript of 1841. The resolutions of the Synod again re-affirmed the leading principles of 1826, adding other suggestions suited to the time; especially objecting to the recent rule of the Board respecting the conditions on which it gives aid to the building of schools; and forbidding Catholic schoolmasters, while in training schools, to attend lectures on history given by a Protestant professor. We know not what answer the government vouchsafed to that Synod, unless the “Ecclesiastical Titles’ Bill” was that answer. In 1856, a pastoral issued by the entire Hierarchy to the Catholics of Ireland, condemned the prohibition of the sign of the cross in the Catholic national schools. That pastoral, and another one published in 1857, re-affirmed the principle that a separate education for Catholics is to be *preferred* to a mixed education,

especially as that term is now understood. In the latter year the last Catholic prelate connected with the Board left his seat there. The protests of individual prelates, especially against model schools, from the time that their character became clearly understood, have been numerous. The most important of them was that of the Archbishop of Dublin, in 1851. The letter of his Grace to Alderman Boylan points out the practical identity of the system pursued in the model schools and that of the Queen's Colleges, and traces the gradual deviations from the original principle of the National system. In August 1858, the prelates of the province of Tuam, with their Archbishop at their head, published a pastoral protesting against the erection of a model school in Sligo.

Such have been the successive and vain efforts of the Catholic prelates to keep the system as clear as possible from abuses, a system which they had never, as a Body, cordially approved of, but which they had agreed, with the exception of the Archbishop of Tuam, to try as an experiment. They were encouraged to this course by the Papal Rescript of 1841. That Rescript, after adverting to various circumstances of the time, which rendered any decision respecting the *principle* of "mixed education" a difficult thing, stated that the Holy See had "resolved that no judgment should be *definitely pronounced in this matter*, and that this kind of education should be left to the prudent discretion and religious conscience of *each individual bishop*, whereas its success must depend on the vigilant care of the pastors, on the various *cautions to be adopted, and on the future experience which time will supply*." Among the cautions alluded to above are these—that all books containing aught injurious to Catholicity should be removed from the schools; that Catholic preceptors only should "give religious, moral, or historical lectures to the Catholic schoolmasters in the model school;" that "it is much safer that literary instruction only should be given in mixed schools, than that the fundamental articles, as they are called, and the articles in which all Christians agree, should be taught there in common;" and that "it would be very useful that the school-houses should be vested exclusively in the bishops or the parish priests." Furthermore, a significant recommendation is added, viz., that it is also their (the bishop's) duty *strenuously to endeavour to obtain from the Government*

by degrees, a better order of things and more equitable conditions." Such was the Rescript which has been represented as a complete and cordial approval by Rome of the National system. It put an end to the public controversies on the subject which had previously divided the Episcopate. The bishops have endeavoured, but in vain, to carry out the cautions suggested in that Rescript. Should they finally fail in this attempt, what can remain for them but to act yet more strenuously than at an earlier period on the recommendation which that document includes?

The above brief retrospect is a comment necessary for the understanding of the recent Pastoral. To interpret the text by the context, is the course generally prescribed by good sense, and by candour. We have furnished the context. "The Mixed System" is an expression with two very different meanings. Sometimes it is used in the abstract, and denotes only a system in which children belonging to different religious denominations, are educated in the same schools. The second, and more ordinary meaning of the formula, is the concrete one of the system such as we have it. In the latter sense, the system has been condemned as decidedly dangerous. The two meanings of the expression are distinctly recognised in the words "mixed education, whether as such, or as in actual operation." Even in the former sense, the system has been spoken of in severer terms than it has before been, owing, no doubt, to the abuses which, as experience has proved, it so easily generates, and retains with such tenacity. A decided preference for the separate system has been also pronounced; nay, it is clearly stated that certain principles which "*should*" be carried out in Catholic schools, can be "*adequately*" carried out in that system alone. These are the strongest expressions in the Pastoral. That it disapproves "mixed education," even in the abstract, and on principle, is certain; and that it declares war against that system, *as it now exists*, is clear also. It does not follow from this by necessity, that the "mixed system" if brought back to its original principles, would be rejected, though it is plain that a system based on sounder principles would be preferred. Reforms have not, it is true, been again demanded; but to reiterate demands again and again contumeliously rejected, is not a course generally considered either dignified or expedient. The Pastoral

assumes that reform has been finally refused ; and that the system has to be maintained *as it stands*, or else to be discarded. The Hierarchy, accordingly, turns its face to the east, and points to that principle which alone it regards as thoroughly sound and finally safe, and in which it desires ultimately to rest. This is obviously not conclusive as to the immediate question ; for a great principle is a star by which we steer, without reaching it ; and the final port is a very different thing from the sea-voyage thither. At all events, writing as we do without authority, we may abstain from determining on a doubtful point. Labouring in the cause of peace, and assuming that all Catholics agree that no education is fit for their children which imperils their faith, we think we shall place beyond doubt the fact that their faith can only be protected either by the separate system, or else by such a searching reform of the present system as will prevent the recurrence of its abuses. We have a people, and we have a cause. When these are united the result is not doubtful, on the long run. Between the alternatives we have named, the State will have to make its choice. There is no reason why, by throwing itself upon an extreme course, it should render peace impossible.

It can be hardly necessary to advert at length to an argument sometimes urged against any demand for reform in education. We allude to the rhetorical assertion that to reject what has once been accepted is a breach of faith. It would not be easy to point to any engagement by which ecclesiastical authorities, at either side, had bound themselves to abide by whatever they had once agreed to try. It was expressly as an "experiment" that some important parts of the national system were adopted ; and experience only could determine what their effect would be. It seems somewhat whimsical that this plea for stability should be urged by those who have themselves introduced the changes complained of. It was urged some years ago, but of course in vain, as a means of protecting two books which it was found necessary to withdraw from the list sanctioned by the Board. The character of the National system was determined without even an act of parliament. An act of parliament itself pretends to no "finality," and the person who introduces it, has an equal right to propose its repeal, provided always that care be taken to protect any interests that may be thus compromised. In such a

matter as education, we need hardly observe that nothing could be more immoral than for the clergy of any religious denomination to connect themselves with the State at all, if they were, in so doing, to contract an engagement superseding their first duty, that of providing for the religious welfare of the flocks committed to their charge. The argument of "consistency" was used in England some twenty years ago. The following passage, taken from a magazine edited by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, will shew that it was regarded by that accomplished and most remarkable writer as indicating rather the urgent need of reform, than the impropriety of seeking reform.

"For though the Committee of the Council may not be aware that men who have once acknowledged a power about the legitimacy of which they have long been doubtful, afterwards, for their own credit's sake, and the ease of their consciences, are eager to justify encroachments which at first they would have thought intolerable, rather than to recognise the truth of warnings which they despised; though the supporters of the Committee may not know that this has been the history of every tyranny which has been in the world—its chances of ultimate success great, in proportion as its beginnings were slender, and its demands plausible—so very obvious an inference from the records of the past, cannot easily escape those who are watching their proceedings; not suspiciously, from hatred of them, but jealously, from love to their country. And therefore, such persons must lift up their voices and say, 'Once admit State control into education, and let those who propose it be as honest as they may; let the agents they select be the least offensive possible; yet you have given up a ground which you must, if possible, recover, but which, we fear, you will have cause to your latest day, to repent that you ever abandoned.' We know that the utterance of such words, still more the frequent repetition of them, must be tormenting to some, tiresome to others; that one will accuse us of party spirit; another, of over-caution, a third, of a determination to hinder, by all means, the spread of education in the land. If we are not prepared for such charges, if our principle is not sufficiently stable to bear us up under them, we are unfit to live in this day: perfectly incapable of doing any good in it."*

There are some who deny that the National system is materially changed. This is a matter of *fact*. It is in a work which gives a complete resumé of that system, both as regards its history and its present workings, that we may

* Educational Magazine. May 1840, p. 332.

expect to find that information necessary to enable us to ascertain how the fact stands. Such a work has been published under the title of "The Catholic Case Stated." It has been met hitherto chiefly by recriminations accusing the author of inconsistency, and suggesting various unworthy motives under which he may be supposed to have written his work. Into this war of personalities we shall of course not enter. We have prefixed to this article the names of such replies or attempted replies to the "Catholic Case" as we have seen, and also Mr. Kavanagh's reply to them. We are not surprised that the celebrated book in question should have called forth personalities, for we regret to say that it contains a great deal of the same sort: what however does surprise us is, that it should have encountered so little else—so little that even pretends to be an answer to its statements. Attacks on an author's character are relevant chiefly when it is as a witness that he comes forward. It is not in this capacity that we have to deal with him. Apart, however, from his individual opinions, and from evidence not demonstrated, to which we shall seldom allude, Mr. Kavanagh's book has collected together such an amount of information that we shall consult the convenience of our readers in making our quotations largely from it when referring to facts, rules, official documents, statistics, parliamentary returns, &c. Our readers will thus find it more easy to refer to our quotations, and to verify them by appeal to original sources. When therefore, no other book is mentioned, it is to his that our references are made. Any one, however, who possesses a copy of Archdeacon Stopford's* Report on the Schools of the Diocese of Meath, (1844) will find a history, not less able and detailed, of all the chief changes which had taken place in the National system up to the date of that pamphlet. Had we seen it earlier we should have quoted from it more largely than we can now do. The Archdeacon affirms repeatedly, and clearly proves, that even previous to the changes which he desired when he wrote, and which have since taken place, the alterations already made were, not only numerous, but *essential* and *fundamental*, absolutely reversing the principles, in several instances, upon which the system had been introduced.

* Grant, Milliken, and Bolton, Dublin 1844.

He proves also that all the changes were made in the Protestant interest. No greater benefit could be done to the cause of education than by the re-printing of this Pamphlet, omitting only the charges needlessly brought forward respecting the secrecy of the said changes, and against the probity of the Board.

The alterations in the National system of education may be referred to three classes: 1st, changes as regards its Principles and Rules: 2nd, changes in its essential *character*, produced by the nature of its books, by institutions forming at first no part of it, and by its use of patronage: and 3rd, changes in its actual working, and practical results. Besides these, good sense requires also that a due weight should be attached also to the changes, political and social, which have taken place since the system was first introduced, and the degree in which they tend either to encourage more of trust, or to demand more of prudence on the part of Catholics.

The advantage derived from a complete and simultaneous view of these changes consists chiefly in our being thus enabled to consider them in their *joint* result. Taken separately, they carry with them a less marked significance. One of them is pushed aside as trivial; another was accidental; a third was obviously necessary; a fourth was conceded by all parties. It is when we stand upon a height that we see what has been the general course of a river, not when following its curves. It is the tendency of every institute to extend its influence, consolidate its power, and multiply its ministrations. This is its instinct: it results often from a zeal on the part of its members without which it could not have worked efficiently. All that we require is that men whose good intentions we do not contest should prove them by correcting, when indicated, the abuses which they failed to prevent.

One of those changes involved dangers not originally foreseen; viz. the introduction of religious teaching at the hours of combined instruction. It is one of two alterations early made, and of such importance as to amount to a change of principle. The original principle, as laid down by Mr. Stanley in 1831, was

“That the schools be kept open for a certain number of hours on four or five days of the week, for *moral* and *literary* instruction

only; and that the remaining one or two days in the week be set apart for giving *separately*, such *religious* education to the children, as may be approved of by the clergy of their respective persuasions. The commissioners will also permit and encourage the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their respective persuasions either before or after the ordinary school hours on the other days of the week.*

The system, as originally set forth, was announced by Mr. Stanley as one "from which should be banished even the suspicion of proselytism." Such it might have continued but for that afterthought, the ill-considered though doubtless well-intended introduction of religion into the *combined* portion of instruction. Too great proximity produces collisions. Had the religious part of the education continued separate, half the bickerings which have since arisen might have been avoided, and an efficient religious education might have been carried out. But in snatching at the shadow, the substance was dropped. A *principle* can never be given up without grave loss. A definite line had previously been laid down between that portion of the education which was to be combined, and that portion which, by an unfortunate necessity, must remain separate. That line once obliterated, religious instruction became a species of border warfare contested on the "debatable ground" of theology without definite doctrine. The Scripture Extracts which originated from this attempt, were met by a storm of indignation at the Protestant side; while, if they had never been heard of, the whole of the Protestant Bible might have been taught to Protestants during adequate and ample hours of separate instruction, and the Douay Testament might have been read to Catholics, or by them. The innovation was proposed by the Rev. Mr. Carlisle who, on one occasion, vindicated it as an "experiment" toward "introducing *scriptural light* among the population generally." He probably did not know that the Douay Testament was one of many religious books which Dr. Doyle had long since required to be provided in all his schools. No one would think of teaching religion to children in the form of scholastic definitions, but to be taught effectually, it must be taught in the spirit of freedom, not with the enfeebling constraint that belongs to compromise. Charity is a

* Catholic Case Stated, p. 19.

thing that lies far deeper than mere concession ; and as for *mutual* concession, as regards Catholic and Protestant teaching, the thing cannot exist. If there is to be a *common* religious teaching the whole of the concessions must come from Catholicism, because it holds whatever of positive doctrine is retained by Protestants, with the addition of a great deal to which they object. But as the Catholic believes that the doctrines denied by Protestants are involved in the doctrines which they have retained, it follows that if he undertakes to teach the latter to Protestant children, it is not really in a merely Protestant sense that he can do so. That God "became man" is with him a statement identical with the proposition that Mary is "the Mother of God." The latter he is not allowed to teach to Protestant children : and yet at the end of each lesson in the Scripture Extracts is a series of questions ; and the theory of this form of instruction is that knowledge is to be first "questioned into children and then questioned out of them"! It does not seem strange that zealous Protestants should have disapproved of this mode of instruction, and that Catholics who are no less at the mercy of Protestant teachers, should be discontented at finding that these Scripture Extracts were taught in 1853, either habitually or occasionally, in 42 per cent of all the national schools, the majority of teachers in those particular schools being Protestants. (p. 35.) Still more of contention and mutual distrust has been occasioned by others of the works introduced to further a combined religious education. The simplest mode of preventing such contention in future seems to us that of cutting off their original source. Whether any engagements have been contracted which render such a remedy impracticable we leave others to decide. Where deviations from the original System, of a character hostile to Catholics, have been ratified by irrevocable engagements, Catholics have an obvious right to some *equivalent* advantage, by way of compensation.

As the change from the original principle of a separate religious education, came from the Protestant side, so did another change of the same sort. It is early referred to in Mr. Kavanagh's book.

"Lord Stanley's letter contained, among other things, permission 'to supply the schools with works of separate religious

instruction *at prime cost.*' But the Protestant Commissioners, at the first regular meeting of the Board, (1st Dec. 1831) declined to agree to supply such books to Catholics. Connected with this, it was proposed to circulate, at prime cost, and for *separate* religious instruction, both versions of the New Testament, to which proposal the two Catholic Commissioners agreed. The Protestant members again dissented, unless the *notes* were omitted from the Douay Testament. Rev. Mr. Carlisle then proposed that they should ask *permission* from the government *not to require them to exclude* from the several books which they had got permission to edit 'such portions of Sacred History, or of religious or moral teaching as may be approved by the Board.' After much discussion, his proposition was assented to, with little expectation of its practical success, and with the condition that the entire Board should be unanimous in approving of any such matter as might be introduced. This *permission not to exclude* such new element from combined or common instruction was granted by Lord Stanley, and a sentence to that effect was added to the original draft of his letter, which *amended* copy was first published by the Board in 1842."

The alteration thus made was a further compromise between the principle of a *separate* religious education, and that of a *combined* religious education, and it united the difficulties of both principles without realizing the benefits of either. It belongs to the ordinary *mechanical* view of religion as a thing not only including *distinguishable* parts but parts capable of being separated or reunited at will, like the sticks in a fagot; and for this reason, even more than from its liability to abuse, it was repugnant to Catholic sympathies.

We shall now refer to another great change of Principle, by which the later changes in the Rules have been largely occasioned. Not only in all communities that claim the name of churches, but even in the most transient sects, the clergy exercise an admitted influence over the education of their respective flocks, and especially over that of the poor. Their guidance is claimed on the ground of religious expediency, quite irrespectively of ecclesiastical authority. The necessity for it is obvious. Every conscientious parent wishes his children to be brought up in the religion which he himself believes to be true. But how is the peasant to ascertain what schools are to be trusted in this matter, and what are to be shunned as dangerous? What can he know about books he has never read, or of a Board

* Catholic Case Stated, p. 21.

of which he could not explain a single function? Can he always detect erroneous teaching, even in its graver forms; and is it not notorious that it is, in its more latent forms, that error is most dangerous? Supposing him capable of deciding on what is objectionable in a *positive* sense, can he judge of what is negatively dangerous? Can he decide whether the *omission* of this or that portion of religious instruction, or devout observance, is likely to prove a snare? This is a matter which changes with the various changes in the social and political atmosphere by which he is affected; to master it the poor man must know a good deal of ethical philosophy, as well as of history and theology, and hardly needs a pastor. But if he requires advice, from whom is he to receive it? From the newspapers? They may be written by infidels. From his landlord? he may be an excellent man, but his very charities may be stimulated by his religious predilections. From the State? But what if he be a Dissenter;—or what if he be a Roman Catholic, and with all due respect for the State, thinks, notwithstanding, that a Nation which affects to rule its own Spiritual Teaching, and Believing, by its own authority, is as foolish as a man who claimed the like despotic authority over his own watch, setting its hands according to his caprice, without reference to any rule so rigid or external as that of the parish clock or the sun, and changing them to suit his convenience? The peasant's natural adviser is evidently the religious community to which he belongs; of this his clergy are the exponents; and by their advice he is guided; not from any absurd notion that every part of instruction must be taught theologically, but because his pastor is the best and most responsible judge as to whether a particular educational course, as a whole, be or be not safe in its religious bearings. These principles are admitted by all alike, except at periods when enthusiasts or politicians aspire to effect some religious change, and labour to bring it about by assuming an antagonism where both God and nature have established a harmony without which society would be a chronic anarchy—a harmony between the parental and the pastoral authority.

To apply this. The National system of education, as originally instituted, *recognized* both pastoral and parental authority, *enforcing* the latter, though not the former. As modified by its recent changes, it recognizes the

parental only, leaving it to enforce itself; while to the pastoral it now assigns no place, in a vast majority of the schools. It puts them in contrast one with the other; and, if it does not directly create an antagonism between them, it tends to do so indirectly, partly by rules which deprive the clergy of privileges originally theirs—rules made at the instance (as we shall shew) of those who denounce their authority as a usurpation—and partly by a habitual defiance of the wishes of the clergy, as regards many important parts of education.

Let us appeal to documents. Mr. Stanley's Letter, published in 1831, by which the National system was inaugurated, bound it by two engagements, the practical identity of which will become the more plain the more we consider them as illustrated by recent experience—the repudiation of Proselytism, and the recognition of Pastoral authority. The first is expressed in these words: "The Commissioners of 1812 recommended the appointment of a Board of *this description*, to superintend a system of education, from which should be banished even the suspicion of proselytism, and which, admitting children of all religious persuasions, should not interfere with the peculiar religious tenets of any." He next proceeds to mention the Kildare-street Society, one cause for the failure of which, he finds in the circumstance that it insisted on the reading of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment.

"It seems to have been overlooked, that the *principles of the Roman Catholic Church* (to which in any system intended for general diffusion throughout Ireland, the bulk of the pupils must necessarily belong.) were totally at variance with *this principle*; and that the indiscriminate reading of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment, by children, must be peculiarly obnoxious to a *Church* which denies, even to adults, the right of unaided private interpretation of the Sacred Volume with reference to articles of religious belief."—p. 415.

In his next reference to the clergy he states the practical consequences of denying their just rights.

"Shortly after its institution, although the Society prospered, and extended its operations under the fostering care of the Legislature, this *vital defect* began to be noticed, and the Roman Catholic clergy began to exert themselves with energy and success, against a system to which *they were on principle opposed*, and which they feared might lead in its results to proselytism, even although no such object was contemplated by its promoters. When this oppo-

sition arose, founded on such grounds, it soon became manifest that the system could not become one of National Education."—p. 415,

The Roman Catholic clergy are here recognized as men having "principles" and acting on them. In the jargon of a day which may be said, when compared with 1831, nay, with 1812, to have indulged in "reactionary" notions, their opposition is commonly attributed, not to conscientious principles, but to very sordid motives. Here, however, a system which incurs their just and necessary distrust, is said to have a "vital defect" in it, for the reason that their flocks must be supposed to be of one mind with them, so long as both remain Roman Catholics.

Archdeacon Stopford, in his Report of 1844, (p. 12-13) enumerating the changes in the National system which have entitled it to the support of the Protestant clergy, gives a prominent place to the repudiation of that principle of Pastoral right which he speaks of as actually a part of the original charter. He says,

"It appears to have been felt that this *part of their charter* was ill adapted to effect united education. The Board have never *professed* to found their Rules on such a principle. They have in fact skilfully set it aside, and substituted a different principle in its place. About the year 1833, they applied for, and obtained official explanations of Lord Stanley's letter. One object of these explanations was to substitute *Parental for Priestly* authority, as the principle to which concession was to be made."

This change he further illustrates by a comparison of the Rule of 1832 with that of 1833. Naturally, a change which recommends the system to him bears to us a less alluring aspect. Is it wonderful if the Catholics who broke up the earlier system of the Kildare-street Society should be discontented with a system intended to correct its faults, but which has been frequently declared by Protestant clergymen, to lend them far better opportunities of propagating what they imagine to be Scriptural Truth, and what we know to be Protestant Traditions? Would it have been wiser in the Government which introduced the National System of Education to have gone on ignoring the "vital defect" of that which preceded it, and to have stigmatised with opprobrious imputations those who were clearer-sighted than themselves;—or were they wise in correcting that defect? If the latter is the truer judgment, the State will act wisely,

if it corrects *in time*, the defects of the present system. When a system has drifted from its original engagements, the consistent are those who stand by old principles, not those who follow that which fleets, and vindicate change. Under the present system a zealous Protestant clergyman boasts that he can teach to Catholics that doctrine which Luther declared to be the "*articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ*." Let him do so by all means to all Catholics who wish for his ministrations, or even to all who can be induced to believe that the shy Nymph, Truth is to be found no more in her fount of old, but at the bottom of the "souper's" pot. But let him not do so through the system of National Education.

Mr. Stanley proceeds, "They (the Commissioners) will require.....that the remaining one or two days in the week be set apart for *giving separately such religious education* to the children as may be approved of by the *clergy* of their respective persuasions." Will they? No they will not. A change made in the rules after the system had been eight years at work—made in order to propitiate the Presbyterians—deprives Catholic children, in all non-vested schools under Protestant patrons, of any right to religious instruction in those schools, at the hours either of combined or of separate instruction. (p. 276 and 419.) "They will also permit and encourage the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their respective persuasions either before or after the ordinary school hours on the other days of the week." Will they? There are, as we shall find hereafter, about 100,000 Catholic children in schools where any claim to such ministrations may be legally and effectually resisted.* (p. 419.) "They will require that a register shall be kept in the schools, in which

* The Rev. J. Mac Ivor insists almost as strongly as Archdeacon Stopford on this change, and its immense importance. Writing to induce his brethren to join the National System, he warns them not to "sustain an organised opposition after its real grounds have vanished." The question, he says, is no longer about "schools, respecting which the clergyman was obliged to bind himself in perpetuity, to share the hours of religious instruction with teachers of all other religious denominations, and actually to allow the priest and dissenting minister to enter his schools, along with himself, and teach their special tenets to all who were willing to learn them."—*Proposed Modifications of the Non-Vested System*, p. 51. McGlashan, Dublin, 1850.

shall be entered the attendance or non-attendance of each child on divine worship on Sundays." Here not only the Catholic clergy are duly recognized as such, but Catholic worship also. It is not so now; and the laity are not the gainers. Children are sometimes taught by fables:—those in the national schools should have been taught the old fable about the sheep that were advised to get rid of their shepherds.

In England, during the early part of the battle which the Established church had to fight in defence of religious education, an attempt was occasionally made to raise the cry of "Parents in danger." It was thus replied to in the "Educational Magazine," apparently by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, a writer remarkable for the zeal with which he has always maintained the sanctity of the Family.

"But if we dare to hold and proclaim such a doctrine as this, H. C. has a terrible threat in reserve for us. He will proclaim us to the 'fathers of families.' He will tell them that we mean to invade their rights; to substitute priestly for paternal authority. 'Citizens,' he will say, 'your houses are your castles. The Queen cannot enter them; the Queen dare not. But the emissaries of the National Society will. Nay, they will not be content with entering them: they will push their way to your innermost sanctuaries—to the nursery, to the schoolroom—your children's books will be examined; your children's wardrobe will be criticised. The reports of the National Society will tell what progress your boys have made in the 'Arabian Nights', or in 'Robinson Crusoe'; the shape of your daughter's bonnets, the colour of their pelisses, will be subject to an intolerable ecclesiastical dictation.' Now to all this what can we reply? Simply that in all past times, State education has been the great invader of domestic right and privileges, and that ecclesiastical education ceases to be ecclesiastical when it dares to meddle with them."*

Are Catholic parents benefited or injured by the injury done to ecclesiastical authority? The answer to this question is found in the large system of proselytism to which a fuller notice will be given in its proper place. No doubt on many occasions such attempts were carried on by means of abuses which the commissioners would have disapproved. Their inspectors however do not seem to have been always encouraged to report very freely upon such cases.

"If they find Catholic children, in thousands, as they are,

* Extract from the "Educational Magazine," May 1840, edited by the Rev. F. D. Maurice.

receiving the fulness of Protestant religious instruction from Protestant teachers or clergymen, in national schools, they are not to report it, unless they can prove that the Catholic pupils were *compelled* to be present; nor are they to report it to the parents or to the pastors of those children.—They are to wait until the parents who may know nothing of it, complain of the practice.” p. 329.

Examples are given in which the precept to diplomatists, “*surtout point de zèle*” was very stringently asserted. (p. 405.) The conduct of the Board, on such occasions, must of course depend upon its views as to what constitutes or does not constitute proselytism. In p. 158 is found a remarkable judgment upon this subject. The Board had its attention called by the Right Rev. Dr. Denvir, to the state of the Lancasterian Industrial school at Belfast. An investigation was made: it was proved that from 1847 to 1855 the most flagrant violations of the rules of the national system had taken place; that religious instruction was given habitually to Catholic children by Presbyterians: “that clothing was also supplied, but secular and industrial instruction, breakfast, dinner and supper, were denied to those who absented themselves from *religious instruction*, in the morning, illness alone being considered a sufficient apology for absence. The Catholic girls were required to attend on Catholic holidays and were refused permission to go out to hear mass.” The parents of Catholic children having objected to their being obliged to receive Protestant religious instruction, their objection was thus responded to by the committee which superintended the school. “That as the objection to the *joint reading* has been traced to the Roman Catholic priest, the parent averring that she herself did not object, we hereby declare that *we will receive no dictation from such a source.*”*

* A very different view of Pastoral influence is frankly avowed by the most intelligent and experienced Protestant clergymen. “I love to see the filial eye, and full repose of confidence, with which the pupil looks on his own spiritual Pastor, as if he would trust him as, under God, the shepherd of his soul.” (*Thoughts on the point at issue*, &c., by the Rev. Henry Woodward, p. 9, 1844.) Mr. Woodward would not, we are sure, have restricted this salutary influence to Protestant children. He directly denies a favourite allegation,—“I believe a comparatively small number of the Romanists of this country would wish their children to read the Scripture—unless their priests desired it.” (Ibid. p. 25.) In the same Pamphlet he laments the unscrupulous zeal of too many Proselytizers, especially referring to one person who had openly maintained that it was not

We all know the meaning of such averring. A peasant does not like to argue with "the master of forty legions," and simply answers (such at least is the common meaning of the reply) that she is a Catholic and abides by the direction of her Church. The Board decided emphatically against the managers of the school, but stated notwithstanding,

"After a careful examination of the evidence the commissioners are of opinion that in the management of the school, the committee were not influenced by any desire to convert the Roman Catholic pupils attending it to the Protestant faith, and were sincerely anxious to avoid even the suspicion of proselytism."

Proselytism can, on this principle, never exist till its success has been conclusive and the injury done is past repair. We assume the Board to have been perfectly sincere; but from that very sincerity we are obliged to infer that its notions and ours respecting proselytism differ very seriously; and that in its good intentions we can have no sufficient guarantee for the security of our children until its constitution shall have been rendered less unequal.

Let us now trace in their proper order the changes of Rule which have followed the two alterations of Principle already referred to, viz. that change which permitted of a combined as well as of a separate religious instruction, and that one which subverted pastoral, under the plea of setting up parental, authority.

The first has been alluded to in connection with another subject. It was suggested by the Presbyterian synod in 1833. It was assented to in the case of their schools; "gradually extended; and now obtains prominence in the rules of the Board. In reference to *vested schools* the following clause is contained in the trust deed, and also embodied in the present regulations. (Part i. sec. iv.)

"In all *vested schools*, the parents or guardians of the children have the right to require the patrons and managers to afford opportunities for the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the schoolroom, under proper persons approved of by the parents or guardians for that purpose."—p. 61.

The significance of this Rule appears only when it is taken in connection with other changes. It is but a link in

wrong to give a bribe to a Roman Catholic in order to induce him to renounce his religion. His Pamphlet, which is in defence of the National System, is written in the most admirable spirit.

a chain. It might be of use to Protestant children in schools under Catholic patrons ; but their interests would have been far better provided for by the original rule which gave the clergy *as such* access to *every* school after school hours. It is not, however, Protestant children whose faith is assailed in Ireland at the present day ; and to Catholic children the present rule is but poor compensation for the loss of that pastoral care originally guaranteed in all cases. Why is it the Bible only that is allowed to be thus introduced ?

2. The next change relates to the place for receiving religious instruction.

"Lord Stanley's letter contains no reference to this, but the explanatory document, submitted to the Government, distinctly states that 'facility of access to the pupils at the times specified for religious instruction is to be afforded to the pastors of the children ; that the choice of the place is left to the pastors, but that liberty is to be secured to them to assemble the children of their respective flocks in the schoolroom if they see fit.' (p. 65)..... This rule was violently opposed by the Presbyterians, and several of their schools withdrew in consequence. Rev. Dr. Cooke, in a public protest against the National system, thus describes this rule : 'The Romish priest is a visitor of the school, whether the committee will or not, and can turn out the Protestant children, one day in every week in the year, to teach that Protestants are heretics.' This rule, entitling the pupils of all persuasions to the use of the room for receiving religious instruction in it, continued in force until rescinded in January 1840, for the Synod of Ulster." p. 67.

Well may Archdeacon Stopford triumph in this alteration. Speaking of it in his Report of 1844 he says,

"The importance of the change can hardly be over-rated, whether we consider it in reference to the Board themselves, or in reference to National education at large. The Board, after having boasted of complete success in carrying out their system, have practically acknowledged that their only Rule, as to religious instruction, has failed ; they have formally abandoned it in three-fourths of their schools, to which they now apply, without any discrimination, a regulation which might, except under peculiar local circumstances, be at variance with their fundamental principles.....So far as it (the change) extends, i. e. to three-fourths of the whole, it divests our National education of a religious character, and makes it, as such, merely secular." (p. 35-36.)

In Ulster those "peculiar local circumstances" do not commonly exist.

3. The next change relates to the *time* for imparting religious instruction. It is thus described by Mr. Kavanagh, p. 68.

"The rule as to the time for separate religious instruction is most clearly laid down in Lord Stanley's letter—one day at least, exclusive of Sunday, to be set apart for that purpose, and permission and encouragement to be afforded to the clergy to give religious instruction, or have it given by those whom they may approve, either before or after the ordinary school hours on the other days of the week.'.....The Presbyterians objected to this rule, because it afforded a *time*, and in their schools a place, for the Catholic clergy to instruct such children as attended Presbyterian national schools, and these days, so set apart, they designated as the '*fifty-two Popish holidays*.'.....In 1838, (Fifth Report) the rule as to the day was changed to 'one day in each week, or part of a day (independently of Sunday) to be set apart for religious instruction.' This was virtually given up in 1840, when the Synod of Ulster came to terms with the Board; and since the amended rules of 1842 (Ninth Report) consequent on the admission of the Presbyterian body, even the part of a day has disappeared."—p. 69.

4 and 5. Two other changes with respect to the time for religious instruction are thus pointed out.

"The permission and encouragement offered to the clergy to give religious instruction before or after the ordinary school-hours, on the other days of the week, were so altered, to meet the views of Presbyterians, that, instead of merely before and after, it could, for eighteen years, be given at any time, within, as well as outside school-hours." p. 74.*

The occasion on which the next change was made is thus stated:

"Under the rules already quoted, the practice of making the 'sign of the cross', and repeating a brief prayer, each time the clock strikes, grew up in some of the convent and other Catholic schools, and when the commissioners made an order against it, many of the managers felt that they could not conscientiously prohibit a Catholic practice, which with many of the children is a domestic habit. The convent schools at Kells, Castlecomer, Sienna, (Drogheda) Cabra, and North William Street, (Dublin) gave up the grants mainly because of these restrictions; many of the other convents have been exposed to serious annoyances on these grounds, and at present, some excellent National schools are threatened with suspension, as the patrons refuse to direct the teachers to prohibit the practice in the schools." p. 73.

* Directions were, however, we believe, given that this permission should not be used in such a way as to prevent the school being attended by any children otherwise disposed to frequent it.

This change of rule is considered by the patrons affected to have been in direct violation of the legal deeds which, during twenty-one years secured to the schools now so unwarrantably interfered with, the privileges in question; and consequently is regarded as a breach of faith. (p. 230.) Protestant children are seldom to be found in convent schools; but if they attended them they would see in the sign of the cross nothing but what every peasant in Ireland is as much accustomed to as he is to any domestic usage or to the salutations which he hears by the wayside.

Mr. Kavanagh thus sums up his "history of the variations" in this matter.

"At present the managers of all non-vested schools may refuse to set apart *any time*, weekly or daily, for religious instruction, or they may allot a time for any denomination they may think fit, and refuse to do so for all others. All the changes made have been for Presbyterians, and against the interests of Catholics."—p. 74.

6. The next alteration in the rules, to which reference need here be made, was the momentous one effected by Archdeacon Stopford. A correspondence on this subject arose between the Archdeacon and the Board, of which the following account is given.

"His (the Archdeacon's) objection was, that whilst the Rules of the Board had been modified, from time to time, the covenants in the Trust Deeds had not been altered to harmonise with the Rules, and under these circumstances Archdeacon Stopford requested, and reasonably, to know by which would he be bound, the Deed which he should sign, or the Rules which were *then* in force." He writes: "There is a sentence in the Rule above referred to which does not seem sufficiently definite for a legal instrument. The sentence to which I allude is as follows: 'That no child be compelled to receive, or be present at, any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object.' This, as I understand it, might mean either—that no child be compelled to receive, or *be compelled to be present at*,—or it might mean, that no child be compelled to receive, or *that no child be present at*, &c. There is an important difference between the two constructions of the sentence. I would bind myself to the former; *I would not bind myself to the latter*."—p. 87.

This representation was made at the end of 1844, but failed for a considerable time to extort from the Commissioners the concession demanded. In 1847 he renewed the correspondence, which had been more than once broken off, and at last with success.

"The result was, that the interpretation which he desired, and which alone he would bind himself to observe, was assented to by the Commissioners, and a grant made to his schools. In the Fourteenth Report, (1847) sec. 89, dated 16th of June, 1848, this change involving the complete subversion of the National System, not only as founded, but as carried on for sixteen years, is thus announced, &c."—p. 88.

A change from a mode of expression, to say the least, so equivocal, that the words complained of excluded from participation in the National System many conscientious Protestants who joined it immediately afterwards, was introduced as simply an authoritative exposition of something already clear! To this Mr. Kavanagh well replies, "had the force or import of words altered from March, 1845, when the Commissioners, with Archdeacon Stopford's clear and fair criticism before them, refused to answer his question?" This subject is also strikingly illustrated by Archdeacon Stopford's evidence before the Select Committee on National Education, in 1854, and by his pamphlets of 1844 and 1847. His statements entirely agree with the account of the transaction given above. The following is his evidence.

"Previous to putting your schools under the Board, did you receive from them satisfactory explanations?—I did; after the lapse of about a year and a half; at first they declined to give me any explanation; but after the lapse of a year and a half, they gave me satisfactory explanations.

"So that it does devolve upon the parent himself to withdraw his child, and he could not claim from you the right of your telling the child to leave the school for him?—Yes, that was the explanation given.

"Do you think that some of the Clergy of the Established Church are labouring under a similar misapprehension to that which you yourself laboured under, previously to your giving your adherence to the Board?—*I do not conceive that I laboured under any misapprehension.*

"You put a different interpretation upon the Rule to that which was given by the Board?—*No; the Rule was altered to meet my views.*" p. 91-2.

To the same purpose is the following evidence given by Mr. M'Cready, Head Inspector, and himself a Presbyterian.

"What was the practical construction? Was it left practically to the Teacher to put them out, or was it left to parental authority to enforce itself?—My opinion is that for a long period it was understood that the obligation lay upon the Patron and upon the Teacher of the school to put out the children.

"Do you believe that this modification, or this explanation of the meaning of that ambiguous Rule, with reference to the attendance of the children, has met with universal satisfaction?—It has very generally satisfied the Protestants, and it was, I may say, at their instance that it was so explained; but I do not think that it is perfectly satisfactory to some Roman Catholics. If they were consulted, I believe they would recur to the old interpretation put by some upon the Rule, and that is, that the children whose parents do not personally approve of their being present should not be allowed to remain during the time of religious instruction."—p. 93.

No doubt they would. A parent at work miles off may know very little about what is taught in a school; or he may have some suspicions, and yet, from negligence or intimidation, may fail to interfere, unable to estimate the full force of temptations to which he was never himself exposed in youth; or lastly, he may have ordered his child to leave the school at the commencement of religious instruction, and yet that child may on this, as on a thousand other subjects, disobey him, not liking to encounter the ridicule of his companions, to face a storm of rain, or to walk home by himself. On the other hand, let those to whom the school belongs, be responsible for the child's attending no religious instruction not sanctioned by his parents, and there is comparatively little danger of his doing so. Here is a case in which parents might have looked for some support from the eloquent assertors of Parental Right. They would have looked for it in vain. We shall have to recur to this subject at greater length.

7. The next alteration in the Rules was the supplement to that last named. When permission was first given to infringe on the original principle of the National System, by the introduction of religious instruction during the hours of *combined teaching*, that concession was vindicated on the ground that provisions had been made of a kind so stringent, as to render the abuse of the concession impossible. One of these guarantees consisted in a Rule by which the objection of a single parent, whether Catholic or Protestant, sufficed to banish, not of course from the school, but from the hours of *combined instruction*, any religious book which he deemed perilous to the faith of his child. (p. 25.) The security thus afforded was done away with in 1853, when a Rule, the converse of that one which preceded it, was introduced. It is thus described: "This

Rule was altered in July 1853, and the extracts and sacred poetry, which are still in use, cannot now be removed, as a portion of *combined instruction*, so long as a solitary pupil does not object to read them." (p. 28.) About the same time, a book to which Catholics objected, "*Lessons on Christian Evidences*," was removed by the Board from their list. "The result to the Catholics was a victory far more disastrous than a defeat." Each single Catholic parent must now lodge his separate objection to dangerous books. Nay, he must go on reiterating that objection, no matter what efforts may be made in opposition to his wishes, by men to whom he rightly shews respect on every occasion in which his religion is not concerned. It is often those whom in temporal concerns he looks up to as his benefactors that he has most to fear. Can any one say that against their solicitations the ill-informed and dependant need no protection? No one will say this who is aware how often Proselytizers have succeeded in wringing from starving peasants a reluctant consent to a still worse course of education; and how bitterly those parents have lamented their weakness when too late, on discovering that schools from which they had anticipated no permanent results, had changed their children into the fiercest enemies of the Catholic Religion.* Children whose parents approve of the books in question are always free to study them during the time set apart for separate religious instruction. Assuming the necessity of a change in this Rule, that change might still have respected the original rights of Catholic parents. The children of Catholics might at least have been prevented from attending such instruction, except when able to show a *written consent* on their parent's part. But such a corrective was rendered impossible by the preceding change of Rule, since which

* This is well put by the Rev. Mr. Woodward. "You admit on the one hand that the Priests are averse to the introduction of the whole Bible into schools. * * * You allow, therefore, that if the Roman Catholic children attend your schools, they do in so grave a matter renounce the authority of their Pastors. All this you admit, on the one hand; and on the other hand, you disclaim the design or wish to make these children proselytes."—(*Thoughts on the point at issue*, &c. p. 35.) Elsewhere he ridicules the ordinary subterfuges. "If like the medical Doctors, the teachers can *warrant* to the Roman Catholics, that this medicine (though nauseous enough to them) may be taken by their children *with perfect safety*; what is all this," &c. p. 38. Would that all his brethren understood this!

patrons are not bound to remove any child, under any circumstances. The two Rules act conjointly like the two limbs in the same pair of shears.

An endeavour is sometimes made to diminish the force of the changes we have referred to, by maintaining that the Non-vested Schools should be considered as constituting a wholly separate system, supplementary to the original National System, and therefore not bound by its principles. But facts will not correspond with this theory. The National Education of Ireland does not profess to consist of two opposite systems. Every change has been assumed to be in harmony with the original principles of Mr. Stanley's Letter, which is still appealed to as authoritative. The professed object of the system continues to be the same as at first, viz., the education of the Irish people without interference with their religious faith. Once admit that the system is not one in principle, as in aim, and all effectual control over it must cease; for it would be as easy to maintain that the Model Schools constitute a system of their own, as that the Non-vested Schools do so; and innovations not yet foreseen, might thus in time claim their place, each as a "chartered libertine." The Non-vested Schools have become the vast majority. We have no objection whatever to them; on the contrary, we regard them as the best, if provisions were but made to prevent their working unequally. What we complain of is, that to promote their increase, especially in the north, concessions have been made at variance with the solemn engagements of the National System. So far as those concessions promote the more religious education of our Protestant fellow-countrymen, we are heartily in sympathy with them: but this advantage might have been gained without compromising the rights of Catholics. When the National System was introduced the Catholics of Ireland became entitled to a fair, if not to a perfect system of education. The State became morally bound to carry out that system to the full extent of their wants, no matter whether others availed themselves of it, or threw vexatious obstacles in its way. To vary that system to the disadvantage of Catholics, retaining still its name, seems to us a violation of faith.

8. The next change to be noticed is one by which Convent Schools are seriously affected. It is thus set forth:

"A new Rule has been also introduced, designed to check the

extension of Convent Schools in large towns, and which refuses aid to more than *one* school under the same religious community. In Limerick the Sisters of Mercy have *branch schools* in different quarters of the town, which they attend, going from the convent in the morning, and returning thereto in the evening.”—p. 244.

Conventual Schools, conducted by men, are no less discouraged by a similar rule, which may take its place here as change the 9th.

“In the new code of 1855 the following rule has been introduced: ‘No clergyman of any denomination, or (except in the case of Convent Schools,) member of any religious order, can be recognised as the teacher of a National School;’ and as Monastic Schools had always been referred to under the generic designation of *Convent* Schools, this rule attracted little notice. The citizens of Cork, anxious to extend the excellent Monastic Schools of their city, applied for, and obtained from the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, a site for a school, the grant having been made on condition that it was to be a National School. When the school was ready to be opened, under the Brothers of the Presentation, it was only then ascertained that no grant can now be given to monks’ schools, the rule referred to prohibiting aid to any school under a religious community of men.”—p. 245.

* The injustice thus suffered by the Conventual Schools both of men and women, is the more flagrant when we call to mind two circumstances: 1st, that Model schools, under the exclusive patronage of the Board, are being extended over all parts of Ireland, in spite of the reclamations of the clergy: 2nd, that the Conventual education so obviously natural in a country predominantly Catholic, has again and again received the most unqualified praise from Protestant no less than from Catholic authorities. Among the former are the Protestant Bishop of Derry, Dr. Higgin, and Mr. Stapleton, who says, “I heard a class in this school (King’s Inn Street, Dublin,) asked Scripture facts, and found a correctness and readiness of answer which I have not yet seen surpassed.” Mr. Maurice Cross, Secretary of the National Board, stated to the Lords’ Committee in 1854,

“I am persuaded that in Conventual Schools the literary instruction is conducted with even greater advantage and success than in many of the ordinary schools. That is caused by the fact that the Convent Schools are conducted by a number of ladies of superior acquirements, whose vow and duty it is, according to their religious order, to attend particularly to the education of the poor, and who

take the greatest pains in promoting their literary, moral, and religious instruction. Their schools are models with regard to discipline, neatness, and cleanliness; in fact, *the Convent Schools present, generally, the best specimens of education that Ireland can produce.*" p. 242.

This evidence is confirmed by that of the Rev. Mr. Carlisle, the resident Commissioner, Dr. Kelly, and Dr. Henry, as well as much to the same purpose obtained from the enquiries of Her Majesty's Commissioners of Endowed Schools.

The evidence in favour of the education given by the Christian Brothers is fully as strong.

"The enquiry of the Endowed Schools' Commission has, in one respect, settled the question of Popular Education, and decided that the Christian Brothers' Schools have the best system of instruction, and attain the highest results of any schools in the kingdom. Not merely in the Commissioners' Reports, general and special, but in the reports of the two Commissioners who dissented from some of the views of their colleagues, we find the preeminence of those schools put forward."

A. S. Crawford, Esq., Assistant Commissioner, thus reports:

"Of Parochial, National, Convent, Monastery, Church Education, and many other schools of this class, the most efficient, in my opinion, are the schools managed by the community of Christian Brothers; and I attribute this efficiency to the excellence of their system, the training of the teachers, and their zeal in the cause of education."

The following evidence bears on that most important subject, the difficulty in our busy times of retaining children at schools long enough to make their education a reality. It is to be found in the Report of the Commissioners, p. 247:

"We refer to the interest which well taught pupils feel in the studies they are carrying on. We have observed that in schools where the teachers take the greatest *interest* in the progress of the scholars, and where the standard of instruction is highest, the attendance in *senior classes* is *unusually large*. We have before us one Return—that of the Christian Brothers, in Richmond Street, Dublin—from which it appears that, in a school deserving this commendation, out of 644 pupils in attendance, 188 were between the ages of 12 and 18 years."

The importance of this subject becomes the more striking when we learn that, so difficult has it become to re-

tain pupils long in school, not more than one-fourth part of the children in all the National Schools of Ireland are occupied with the third, fourth, and fifth "Books," and can read a simple narrative. (p. 347-8.) The demand for labour must of itself prove fatal to all education which does not, both by the religious character of the schools, and the *personal influence* of teachers, profoundly affect the feelings of pupils and parents. Conventual Schools being, by the confession of all parties, the best schools existing, whether as regards literary progress, or moral and religious training, one might have hoped that every thing would have been done to encourage them. In principle there was no objection to them.

"In 1832, Lord Stanley, the Irish Government, and the new Board of National Education, unanimously admitted Convent and Monastic Schools to a participation in the public funds for education, on the same terms as all other schools, just as the Kildare Street Society had done, many years previous."—p. 249.

This has not continued to be the case. "The number of ordinary National Schools has increased fourfold since 1837; the number of Convent and Monastic Schools has little more than doubled." The latter being out of all proportion better than the former, it would hardly have been unfair if they had received more of public assistance. Unfortunately the contrary is the fact. "In the aggregate of 4854 *ordinary* National Schools throughout Ireland, the salaries average £49. to each 100 pupils in daily attendance; in the 117 Convent Schools the salaries average £22." (p. 235.) The reason of the difference is this. Originally a capitation grant, proportionate to the number of the children, was paid, of equal amount whether the school was under secular or conventual teaching—

"This capitation rate continued, with slight modification, in the National Schools generally, up to 1839, when classification of the teachers was introduced; and this, for the first time, made the grant of salary to teachers depend, not upon the number of pupils taught by them, but mainly upon their personal scholarship, with occasional consideration of their skill in imparting it. This rule at once excluded the Convent and Monastic Schools from its advantages, as it could not be expected that the members of the communities would submit to its provisions."—p. 234.

The classification of teachers may be a very good thing:—does it not appear, however, to be applied after a fashion a little too rigid, when its practical result is to give to the best teachers less than half the salary paid to the rest? So in the case of the Monastic Schools conducted by men. “The Christian Brothers early joined the National Board, but a few years experience of the system satisfied them that such a connection would frustrate the higher object of their mission.” In 1837 there were, in connection with the Board, eighteen schools under monks; there are now but five. Would it have been impossible, at least in those districts of the south where there is not a single Protestant, to have permitted the Catholic children to have availed themselves of the best possible education without forfeiting the fostering care of the State? Would this have required more of indulgence than is shown in the north, where, under the name of National Schools, Dissenting Meeting-houses receive an educational sanction from the State? It can hardly be thought strange if the Christian Brothers decline to teach in schools where the sign of the cross, and every emblem of the Christian religion is prohibited. What is the consequence of this one-sided liberality? The victory of the State? No: that of the Church. The novercal policy of the State succeeds for the moment; the watchful tenderness and serene strength of the mighty Mother makes way on the long run. Slowly, but surely, an education more wholly Catholic than Catholics insist upon, besieges, without aid from Parliamentary grants, the citadels of intolerance. External to the National System 50,000 boys are trained by the Christian Brothers. Convent children, perhaps alone of all those educated in Ireland, are taught to pray for their Queen. What does the State gain by repelling their loyalty? Does it aspire to make Ireland ultimately one great Educational Monastery, based on the Voluntary Principle like the Irish Church?

“In Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Wexford, Clonmel, Tralee, Dungarvon, Ennis, Dublin, Kingstown, Drogheda, Kells, Mullingar, the Christian Brothers are gradually monopolising the education of the great bulk of the Catholic youth, while the Franciscans and Patricians in the West, and the Presentation Brothers in the South, have important and numerous attended schools.”

With great significance does Mr. Stephens thus remark:

"The education of congregated masses must finally govern the education of a country, and in the progress of this enquiry (that on endowed schools) I had seen proof that the education of the masses of the people, in the great centres of population, is passing into the able hands of the Christian Brothers to the exclusion of the *National Board*."—p. 246.

9. This list of changes may be concluded with one which, had it not encountered a timely opposition, would have placed at the feet of the commissioners the whole National education of Ireland. It is thus referred to :

"The incorporation of the national board in 1845, and the refusal to aid further the erection of schools, unless *vested in the corporation exclusively*, at once arrested the extension of Catholic vested schools. The resolutions of the bishops in 1847, and the decree of the council of Thurles in 1850, against either vesting schools in the commissioners, or transferring to them the trust in those already vested in local trustees, absolutely prevent the Catholic clergy from being parties to accepting building grants on the new terms."—p. 364.

The resolution of the bishops alluded to above is the following :

"That notwithstanding the explanation so kindly given by His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, we are still of opinion that the changes introduced in the national system of education are most serious and dangerous ; that they are in opposition to the instructions of the holy Father, who recommended that the property of the schools should be vested in the bishops and parish priests. That we therefore petition parliament for the amendment of such portions of the system as we deem incompatible with the discipline of our Church, with the full and free exercise of episcopal authority, and with the safety of the religious principles of our Catholic children."—p. 412.

It was in vain that the synod of Thurles thus recorded its protest against this innovation.

"We consider highly objectionable the rule recently made by the commissioners against granting aid towards the building or furnishing of school-houses, unless where the sites of these school-houses are vested in themselves. It is clear that this rule is a great obstacle to the erection of school-houses by Catholics ; it is therefore of the deepest interest to Catholics that it be forthwith rescinded by the government." p. 413.

It was not the Catholic clergy only that opposed themselves to what must otherwise have resulted in a huge Bureaucratical institution based on centralization and at

variance with all those principles of personal exertion and the cooperation of classes, as well as of individuals, which lie at the root of the better part of our modern civilization, and have so largely promoted the cause of education in England, together with that of mutual good will and self respect. The opposition triumphed, as is proved by the following statistical returns.

"At the close of 1857 there were 5455 schools in connection with the Board, of which 3780 were *non-vested*, over the property in which the Board had no control, and 1674 *vested*, to the erection or furnishing of which the Board had contributed. The *vested*, unlike the *non-vested* schools, cannot be withdrawn from connection with the national board, without incurring a penalty, and the control which the commissioners have over them is set forth in certain written instruments called bonds or trust-deeds. Of the 1674 vested schools the observance of the rules is secured by bond in 91; 969 are vested in *local trustees*, and 614 *vested in the Commissioners in their corporate capacity*."—p. 355.

When schools are vested in local trustees the result is of a mixed character. Such schools on the one hand incur more stringent obligations than if they had remained non-vested; on the other they enjoy greater rights, and a more secure hold of the benefits extended to them, the Board being bound to them by reciprocal obligations. But if the schools be vested in the Board, the influence of the central body becomes then greatest. It can, as we understand, depose the Patron, and elect another: nor does there remain, since 1845, a power of withdrawing such schools, upon refunding that small part of the building fund contributed by the Board. Most probably the same instinct led to the creation of the Model Schools, which led to the change of Rule above mentioned. It operates as a serious impediment to the erection of schools.

We now proceed to the second division of our subject, that of changes which have gradually taken place in the National system, apart from changes in its *Rules*.

Of these innovations, the most momentous is the multiplication of Model schools. In Mr. Stanley's letter, a single Model school, to be erected in Dublin, with a view to the training of teachers, is pointed out as one of the duties with which the commissioners are charged. It was afterwards suggested by some of the Catholic prelates that there should be four such institutions, one for each of

the provinces, but only in order to save the young men in training from the necessity of going to Dublin. They have now been multiplied in their different classes, to above the number of 100; their primary object, the training of teachers, has become but a secondary one; and they are schools for the locality. The special character of the Model schools is this, that in them the influence of the Board is supreme. In them the Board has the largest power of limiting or of modifying the religious education, though they can never exclude it; and, as patron, they may require the use of all the books sanctioned by themselves, several of which, if objected to on religious grounds, as for instance a volume of devotional poetry composed by Protestants, can be excluded by private patrons. These schools, in short, represent the teaching authority of the State; the ordinary schools representing that freedom of education in which a sphere is allowed to local, popular, and religious influences. In them the secular character, which is the drawback and danger connected with mixed education, reaches its acme; and from their size and pretensions they affect largely the education given in the neighbouring schools. The Rev. Mr. Fraser's report of his close observation of the working of the model schools in Marlborough Street last year is as follows:

"As the *normal* schools of a country represent its educational thought—as in them principles of popular instruction find their highest exposition and application—I begin by examining them. There is playground superintendence and a *desire* to train morally; but this, on the theory adopted, is impracticable. The highest authority is the human, not the Divine; the will of the creature, not the will of the Creator, is the power that can publicly be acknowledged.....The general tone of the teaching is decidedly unfavourable to that higher and purer morality which should be carefully inwrought in early life. I spent several days in the institution, and now write guardedly when I say I saw in its public work nothing to indicate a belief in Christianity, and little indeed that was more than decently Deistic."—p. 182.

Mr. Fraser being a Protestant, his evidence is not likely to be biassed by partiality to Catholics. His tone is, we think, exaggerated, yet few will be surprised at our not regarding a school which any conscientious man can thus describe as a safe place of education for 2,000 Catholic children, many of whom are afterwards to become the

teachers of the youth of Ireland. These Model Schools sometimes are set up, it would seem, in rivalry of the ordinary National Schools, and flourish at their expense.

"In 1847 they opened the Village Model Schools, Glasnevin; in July 1849, the West Dublin Model Schools;.....in October 1854, they opened the Inchicore Railway School.....In addition to these schools, the Commissioners contemplate erecting other *divisional* Model Schools throughout the city, and for this purpose, sites are desired about Newgate, Smithfield, and other localities. The central Model Schools are now being extended by the addition of *seven* new schools, and it is estimated that the new buildings will afford aggregate accommodation for 3,000 pupils, which will raise the annual strength of the Board's pupils to 7,000. The Catholic Clergy of Dublin thus stand a fair chance of being gradually superseded in the direction of the education of all but the very poorest of their flock, and the matter has already become of the gravest importance."—pp. 184-5-6.

The desertion of the parochial National Schools for the model National Schools, in the hands of the Board, is thus explained:

"As if the more effectually to carry out their object, the Commissioners have grossly neglected the ordinary National Schools in Dublin, which has rendered their own more attractive, and thus drawn thereto Catholic youth from the entire metropolis.....To the large Catholic schools in the city the Commissioners deny adequate teaching power, average salaries, and efficient inspection."—p. 183-4.

The latter statement is illustrated by the following remark, from which it would also appear that, before long, the children in the Dublin Model Schools alone, about nine-tenths of whom are Catholics, will number, when compared with the children in the Dublin National Schools under the Catholic Clergy, as 7 to 18.

"There are 65 National Schools under the Catholic Clergy, in the city, and these are frequented by about 18,000 children, or 9,000 in daily attendance. The attendance in these 65 schools is about equal to that in 260 ordinary schools in the County Tyrone; to the latter the grant of salary is £5,206; to the former less than half that sum." (Note in p. 184.)

It is but fair to add, that this disparity may be accounted for in part by the circumstance of the northern schools being smaller than those of Dublin relatively to the number of teachers.

Within the last few months we have ourselves witnessed some remarkable illustrations of these statements. We have visited in Dublin not a few of the ordinary National Schools under local patrons. Incomparably the best of these were the schools at Phibsborough, attended by about 1000 children. These schools, which were under the patronage of the local clergy, afforded a complete model of what national education ought to be, the instruction, whether in reading, in science, or in music, being first rate. These schools had just been cast off by the Board, because the patron did not think it right to prohibit the sign of the cross, used in them for years, and thus to compromise the other rights guaranteed by the same Trust Deeds! On the other hand in many other of the ordinary National Schools we were very much disappointed at the character of the instruction. We found teachers of an inferior class, and a bad method of teaching, ill-furnished schools, a miserably poor attendance of the children on the roll, and in very many of them, an almost entire absence of all except the youngest children. On enquiring why children of a more advanced age were not there, we were informed that they had gone, in many cases, to the Model Schools. Close to one of the schools thus neglected, we observed another, large and solidly built, and evidently well supported. On reaching it we found that it was one of those which proselytizing zeal gets up for the benefit of Catholics. Three hundred children attended this school, nearly all of whom, we were informed, (for we were not allowed to see them,) were Catholics. The teacher admitted that they received food, and we think, clothes, at the school, but insisted upon it that it was not on that account that little creatures of six and seven years old, attended, but from pure thirst for Scriptural knowledge! Here is the picture made perfect, the text with the comment—an ordinary National School neglected—a good Model School,—and a proselytizing Ragged School supplementary to both.

The practical working of these Model Schools is thus described :

“ The superintendence and chief direction of all these schools is Protestant ; the teaching staff is largely Protestant ; all the books are non-Catholic, and some of them anti-Catholic ; a mere Pagan morality, and a ‘ common,’ or more dangerous ‘ Christianity’ pervade the teaching ; the Scripture prints of Protestant Societies are

the only ones used ; every trace of the symbolism of Catholicity is banished." p. 186.

Sufficient has been said to explain why Catholics disapprove of such Model Schools needlessly multiplied. But two more objections remain behind. These Schools are without any guarantee either for Catholic discipline or for Catholic instruction ;—yet they receive boarders, and they profess to impart those higher departments of education into which the question of religion must needs enter. It is easy of course to teach reading, writing, arithmetic, and geography, apart from religion ; but when lectures are given on history, on logic, on general literature, and on education, as an art, it is next to impossible but that the religious convictions of the lecturer will give to his lectures a bias far the more dangerous, in consequence of its being perhaps unconscious. If the lecturer has himself deduced from history, or from philosophy, no lessons, either favourable or unfavourable to Catholicity, history must have been to him but "an old almanac," philosophy and literature things as worthless as colours are to the blind. He may indeed resolve to lecture on these subjects in a manner to exclude all reference to that which is their soul and their life ; but it will not be easy for him to keep his resolution, especially while treating history, the moral of which depends so much on the mere selection of the facts recorded, and on the relative collocation of them, independently of any inference. The effect of the absence of collegiate discipline, where young men are drawn away from all the salutary restraints of home and neighbourhood, is thus set forth.

"These lads (the pupil-teachers) are from sixteen to eighteen years of age, are selected by the Inspectors from among the monitors, and advanced pupils in the model and in the ordinary schools, and reside, during their course of training, in the Model Schools, where they receive free board and lodging for one or two years. In each Model School the eight lads are mixed as to religion ; in half of the institutions the resident Head Masters and their families are Protestant or Presbyterian, and in the other half the second master, resident also, is Protestant. Whatever defence may be set up for mixed *day* schools, few have ever advocated mixed boarding schools, as in them moral and religious culture are practically impossible."—p. 192.

* * * * *

"Catholic Inspectors pointed out the extreme danger to morals, arising from the domestic circumstances in which teachers, boarders, and servants were placed, and from the absence of the active restraints which religious culture would impose upon them so exposed."—p. 193.

The rapidity with which the Model Schools have been advancing within the last few years, is in itself sufficient to account for the growing alienation of the Catholic clergy from the system.

"Since their incorporation in 1845 the Commissioners have established, or have decided on establishing, the following classes of schools, under their own exclusive management. 1. Literary District Model Schools, (2) District Model Schools, with an Agricultural Branch, (3) Special (as Railway) Model Schools, (4) Agricultural Model Schools, (5) Divisional, or Branch (Town) Model Schools, (6) Ordinary Schools in towns, and (7) Ordinary Schools in poor rural localities.".....The most important are the District Model Schools....."These institutions primarily are superior Ordinary National Schools for the inhabitants of their several localities, and secondarily serve as *Preparatory* Training Schools for an average of eight resident Pupil Teachers annually in each. The Parliamentary estimate for 1858-9, sets down the staff of these 14 *District Literary* Model Schools at 80 Principal and Assistant Teachers, 125 Paid Monitors, who are only senior pupils, and 104 Resident Pupil Teachers, who are *boarded and lodged on the premises*, and to whom only, in the strict sense, the establishments are *training* Institutions. Without interest on the cost of erection and fitting up, which amounted fully to £120,000, the expense of annual repairs, which is considerable, or the heavy item of inspection, the maintenance of these 14 Establishments is set down at £12,440, and clearly the training of 104 lads, some of whom spend *two* years in the District Model Schools, and many of whom never become teachers, cannot be a leading object to justify such an enormous annual expenditure."—pp. 188-9.

What a pity that all the money, talent, and pains bestowed upon these Model Schools should be converted from good to evil, by the introduction of an erroneous principle! They are in fact minor 'Queen's Colleges,' the principle of which is condemned alike by all religious denominations. No attempt is made either to conceal or to palliate their faults. So far as the boarders are concerned the defect of religious discipline might apparently be corrected by giving up some of them to Catholic boarders, and others to Protestant. This system has never been adopted in the Model Schools,

though, in the case of the Queen's Colleges, from which, by the way the Board seems to have drawn many of its inspectors, Denominational boarding houses have been advocated by the favourers of those institutions. If the Model Schools have forfeited the support the clergy were at first disposed to give them, it is because the pertinacity with which they resist modifications which might easily render them of high use, gives but too much cause to fear that the National System itself was but the introduction of the narrow end of the wedge, the broad end being a system of State Education for all classes of society, the middle and the higher, as well as the lower, such as has ceased to be attempted in any country but Ireland. Half an hour in the evening, and the same time in the morning, on four days of the week, and one or two hours on the fifth day, are set apart for religious instruction in these schools. Religion is by no means excluded: those who like it may practice it: it is patronised; but it is not fostered; nor can it be.*

* A more striking contrast there cannot be than that between the Central Training Schools in Dublin and such a training college as the Church of England possesses (to name but one out of many) at St. Mark's, Chelsea, under the admirable superintendence of the Rev. Derwent Coleridge. Like the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, built by our Catholic ancestors, it has its common hall, its library, its cloisters, its garden; but above all its church. We have before us a pamphlet,(a) describing this institution, from which we extract the following. "At nine o'clock the pupils of the college, together with the entire school, attend a full cathedral service in the college chapel. The solemnity and devotion with which this is celebrated must impress every one that takes part in it, and doubtless exercise a great influence in the spiritual culture of the inmates of the college.....The building, which is a very striking one, in the Byzantine style of architecture, has been so fitted as to leave the nave for worshippers not connected with the institution.....It is with a reference to the use and capabilities of a college chapel, in which the students and school children form not merely a full and efficient choir, but a principal part of the congregation, that this method has been introduced; the probable destination of the young men as teachers (in connection with their

(a) A second Letter on the National Society's Training Institution for Schoolmasters, St. Mark's College, Chelsea. By the Rev. Derwent Coleridge, M. A., Principal of the College.

The spirit of the whole is *unreligious*: the essential character of the system is such as to render morally impossible that cordial cooperation on the part of the local clergy without which its religious provisions, such as they are, become of little avail. "Intermediate schools" for the middle classes will doubtless in good time be the "stair-case" to unite the "two stories" of that educational fabric consisting of the National system and the Queen's Colleges. The Rev. Dr. Mac Ivor, in his letter to the Right Rev. Dr. Higgin, one of the commissioners, from which we have already quoted, refers to this subject significantly, and states that, owing to the want of qualified pupils, "the Queen's Colleges languish or threaten to fail;"—to remedy which defect he recommends "to multiply the number of *small model schools*," p. 201.

We have alluded to model schools of an agricultural kind. Of these a considerable number are scattered about the country, and they have we believe done much good; but would that good have been diminished if the chief training school connected with this department had been subjected to religious discipline? There are in it not fewer than eighty boarders. The following evidence, given by Dr. Kirkpatrick, can hardly be satisfactory to any religious person who remembers the temptations to which youth is subject.

"Are you a member of the Church of England?—I am not: I am a Unitarian.

"At Glasnevin you have persons of every shade of religious opinion admitted, have you not?—Yes.

other duties) of sacred music, furnishing an additional motive." The key-note of all this truly ecclesiastical education is thus struck:—"In common with the Christian philosopher whose name I bear, 'my fixed principle is that Christianity without a Church exercising spiritual authority is vanity and dissolution.'" And what is that ritual of which Mr. Coleridge thus beautifully describes the lasting effect on the schoolmaster's whole life, "It leaves a vibration in the heart to which vice may put a stop but not time"? It consists of but a few extracts, scattered leaves blown from the boundless forests of our ancient breviaries and liturgical books. And yet the Church which created these, and retains them, has no means, for want of properly trained schoolmasters, to introduce vespers or compline into her own parish churches, and to work out the mine of devotion in the hearts of her children!

"The lads all live in the establishment at Glasnevin, do they ?—
In the new establishment they do.

"Is there any prayer in common for them ?—No.

"Is there any household prayer at all ?—No ; but every facility is offered to the pupils for attending their respective religious services."

On the *order of the day* "Devotional Exercise" is marked for half-an-hour, morning and evening, and under the head "General Rules" we find, "Neglect of attendance at divine worship on Sunday, and other days set apart for religious duty, will be looked on as a serious offence." To make such directions real, religious authority is necessary. Place the Protestant and Catholic boarders in separate houses, and discipline will at once become practicable.

That several of the National Schoolmasters should have lost their faith and left their Church is not surprising. The evil done is more often expressed in the character of schoolmasters, and in the spirit in which they discharge duties so elevated and so minute that religion alone can qualify for them. We need hardly quote here the high ideal set forth by M. Guizot, as to the function, character, and training, of the Schoolmaster. It was in vain that the Catholic Bishops of Ireland in 1840 and again in 1850, protested against a mode of training directly condemned by the Papal Rescript of 1841. The evil has continued unabated ;—so has the absence of religious discipline. In this respect the central model school is worse than the Queen's Colleges, the students at which are at least free to reside with their parents, as they may at Trinity College, Dublin. In the central training school the State sums up the whole of that influence which it derives from all the various ramifications of the system, with its paid-monitorships, its pupil-teacherships, its inspectorships, and its model schools. Three out of the five Endowed Schools commissioners, though they recommended the mixed system in day schools, expressly condemned it at schools in which residence is required. No religionist, no moralist, no philosopher defends it except on grounds of temporary expediency. For England no statesman would vindicate it. To approve even this part of the English system is by some regarded as almost an act of disloyalty on the part of the Church and the people of Ireland. Yet, all the world over, it is where the State endows and protects a

Church that it expects a reciprocal deference from that Church.

Let us consider next the character of the books. According to Mr. Stanley's letter, as we have seen, the Board was to have furnished at a cheap rate to the children of each religious denomination such religious books as they required. It has produced a very different sort of educational literature. The portion of it which has attracted most attention is the "Scripture Extracts." It is with reference to them that Mr. Carlisle says that, though he could not conscientiously have placed a school in connection with the Kildare Street Society, he can place it under the National Board, because the latter affords greater facility than the former for scriptural instruction. "Do the rules of the Board admit of your giving explanations of the Scripture Extracts while the scholars are engaged in combined instruction?—Certainly." Such was the working of the system until 1853. In that year a rule was made prohibiting the teachers, except at the time set apart for religious instruction, from putting to the children any *other* questions than those appended to the end of each lesson. Virtually however, the Scripture Extracts must ever take their character chiefly from the teacher who examines in them. Mr. Carlisle's explanation of this matter will not prove generally satisfactory even to his co-religionists.

"Is each master to be the judge of the explanation for himself? —He is superintended by the parents of the children, who would make a complaint if they conceived improper instruction was given. Are the parents of the children in the school at the time? —No; but they can easily find out from their children what sort of explanation is given." p. 31.

Such is the protection for Catholic children!

Next we find some 13 or 14 reading lessons or common class books. It does not happen that a single one of these was written by a Catholic, though they are used by more than half-a-million of Catholic children. These volumes, though wholly distinct from those professedly on religious subjects, contain notwithstanding a vast deal upon topics which would generally be thought religious. The Board itself says,

"Lessons on the subject of religion, drawn chiefly from the narratives of the Holy Scripture are interspersed through all the read-

ing books, and constitute an interesting epitome of sacred history. These are commenced in the first book, and carried on through the remaining volumes. The lessons in the first book are of a moral kind, and conclude with one decidedly religious: several in the second book are of the purest and most elevated kind: and the next work following affords a striking example of the successful manner in which some of the most important truths of revelation are blended with secular instruction in the Irish National School Books.....Apart from the scriptural lessons contained in the fourth book it contains several poetical pieces of a *devotional character*. The supplement to the fourth book contains a summary of the Old Testament including a detailed account of the Prophets, and the substance of their prophecies; besides several essays by Archbishop Whateley and other eminent divines. The excellent lessons in the Girls' Reading Book form a complete manual of moral and domestic duties, whether in single or in married life."—p. 40-1.

This is the *ordinary* instruction which in the province of Ulster alone, thirty thousand Catholic children receive from Protestant teachers! Does any one seriously suppose that such instruction can with propriety be given by teachers of one Faith, to pupils of another? These common lesson books have their extracts from Protestant divines, and also from Infidel historians; but so singularly destitute are they of citations from Catholic writers that a child brought up in the study of them might imagine that Protestantism alone had a literature. From lessons without end on merely material facts, scientific morsels and fragments of natural philosophy, he gets glimpses, here and there into the world of morals and religion; but he is as far as ever from the teaching of his Church. It is from writers who probably looked with contempt on his Faith, that he is to learn his earliest lessons of Old Testament history and New Testament doctrines; and passing by the multitudinous harmonies of his Church, whose every breath is song, his devotional feelings are to be trained by the hymns of Wesley and of Watts! Of the history of his own country he is to learn nothing! but he is taught to sing his thanks to the "goodness and the grace" which made him "a happy *English* child." These books already constitute no small part of Ireland's cottage literature. Why should the Irish Catholic remain content with these? This is no necessary part of mixed Education. The English Catholic chooses his school books from a list of more than a thou-

sand volumes all sanctioned by the Privy Council, written by persons of all religious opinions, and many of them admirable alike in their secular and religious departments.

The next great change in the National System, as compared with the aspect it presented at first, results from the mode in which its administration is conducted. The real working of the machine has been placed predominantly in the hands of Protestants, the less important places only being ordinarily given to Catholics. The proof of this statement will be found in the construction of the Board itself, of the Central Training Department, and of the Inspection Department. In many cases the inequality may have arisen accidentally, or been produced by a temporary difficulty. It is from no party spirit or pique, that we require something approaching to a fair distribution of influential places. Catholics naturally are alive to the interests of their co-religionists: Protestants, even with the best dispositions, may be ignorant of them, and may, from that ignorance alone, fatally compromise those interests. The same principle which requires that Catholics should be represented at all, in the working departments of the system, requires that they should be fairly represented. Let us commence with the Board. It consists of fifteen members. Of these nine are Protestant, and six only are Catholic. Considering that something like six-sevenths of the children in the National Schools are Catholic, few impartial persons will regard this as a fair arrangement. The Catholic body has no voice as to the appointment of the Catholic Commissioners, nor can it enforce their attendance at meetings. They are appointed by the Lord Lieutenant, who cannot be a Catholic, and without whose consent the Commissioners cannot make rules. Nor is this all. There is but one Resident and Paid Commissioner, and he is a Protestant. Mr. Macdonnell's character places him above all suspicion of partiality, as regards proselytism, and he has the highest reputation as an accomplished gentleman and scholar. But why should he not have a Catholic coadjutor? The Commissioner in constant residence is of course the one by whom the general working of the system is chiefly determined. On this subject we have the evidence of Mr. Cross, who says:—"I have no doubt whatever that the business of the Board generally, cannot be effectively administered by a numerous Board; that is my decided opinion after

long official experience. In fact, the ordinary business is now transacted chiefly by Mr. Macdonnell, who is the Resident and only Paid Commissioner, myself, and my brother secretary."

Proceeding from the Board to the Central Establishment, it appears from a table given at p. 287 of the "Catholic Case Stated," that its staff is thus arranged. The Heads of Departments include twelve Protestants, with salaries amounting to £5330 per annum. To balance these we find three Catholic officers, with salaries amounting to £1320 per annum, viz., the junior secretary and two *first class* clerks, not one of whom has the direction of a department. Counting the clerks of inferior classes, the staff of the Central Establishment consists of twenty-nine Protestants, and but twenty-one Catholics, the former with salaries amounting to £7,545, and the latter with salaries amounting to £3,546 per annum.*

Let us now look at the important department of Inspection. In the three southern provinces we believe that the Catholic Inspectors bear a fair proportion to the Protestant, when compared with the number of Catholic and of Protestant children at school. But it is in Ulster that there is the nearest approach to united education. It is in Ulster that the Roman Catholic body is weakest, though even there it has a numerical majority in the National Schools: it is in Ulster that the greatest attempts at proselytism are made. It is therefore in Ulster that the greatest efforts to prevent abuses should also be made through a system of inspection impartially administered. But what do we find there? A table in p. 121 answers this question. The Catholic children in the National Schools of Ulster amount to 100,128 in number, the Protestant to less than 73,000. The Catholic Inspectors are two; the Protestant are twenty-one. Nor is this all.

"The distribution of the staff was similarly Protestant, while all these abuses were growing: and since 1846, with the exception of a short period, the Head Inspectors in Ulster were, and now are, Protestants and Presbyterians. The two Catholic officers are

* Within the last few months a slight improvement has been made. A Catholic now shares with a Protestant the direction of the Training and Model Schools; and another Catholic shares in that of the Inspection Department.

juniors in service and station—one a second class, the other a sub-Inspector, and Queen's College man. Six of the Protestants are First Class District Inspectors; the two Head Inspectors, who control the Catholics, are Protestant and Presbyterian."

Surely if the case were reversed, our Protestant fellow-countrymen would not admit that it was mere party spirit that made them discontented with such a state of things as this. The evil is not confined to Ulster.

"A corresponding allocation of the Inspectors favours and promotes the Protestant element in the District Model Schools. Dunmanway, Waterford, Limerick, Kilkenny, Galway—all most Catholic stations—Baillieborough, Newry, Belfast, Ballymena, Ballymoney, and Coleraine, (11 of the 14 District Model Schools,) in operation, are in the immediate charge of Protestant, Presbyterian, or Unitarian Local Inspectors."—p. 189.

In the Model Schools we find the same striking inequality, and here, the Board being supreme in them, we might have hoped that a model of administrative fair play, as well as of educational progress, would have been aimed at. As regards the teachers in the Central Model Schools, we find that, while over four-fifths of the pupils are Catholics, of the instructors in the boys, girls, and infants' school, but eight are Catholics, while twelve are Protestants. (p. 180.) It is in the infants' department of the Model Schools, both in Dublin and elsewhere, that this inequality is most remarkable.

"In the Infants' Department, in the Board's own Model Schools, they are almost invariably of that (the Protestant) creed. In the Central Model School both the Teachers of the Infants' School are English and Protestant; in the West Dublin, Athy, Kilkenny, Clonmel, Limerick, Galway, Trim, Newry, Belfast, Ballymoney, and Coleraine Model Schools, they are all Protestant, the only Catholic Head Teachers being in Ballymena and Waterford. In a few only of these 14 schools are the Catholics in a minority, and in nearly all the others the Protestants form but a trifling fraction of the attendance."—p. 46-7.

To these very young children, more than to others, the mistress stands in the position of a mother; and by none are religious impressions received with more susceptibility. That such impressions should not, in the case of Catholic children, have a Catholic character, is a grave misfortune to them.

Here we must remark upon the anomalous position in

which Catholic Teachers are placed by the circumstance that while the Board disposes of a vast patronage, and thereby exercises a vast influence, it on many occasions sets itself in very needless opposition to the principles and wishes of the Church. Catholic Teachers at least must count Pastoral Authority for something; yet they have often to act in direct opposition to it. If Model Schools are established in places where they are opposed by the Clergy, Catholic Teachers may be also "compelled to instruct Catholic, and non-Catholic children in books condemned by the Catholic bishops, and Catholic Inspectors to examine and report upon the proficiency made in such works." (p. 194.) Nothing of this sort was originally contemplated. The Synod of the province of Dublin, in a Pastoral address to the Catholic clergy and laity,* dated July 1853, expressly enjoins the disuse, so far as Catholics are concerned, of the "Scripture Extracts, owing to the facility with which the questions subjoined to each lesson might be made ancillary to erroneous teaching." Master Murphy's evidence in 1854 (*Queries 8866-7-8*,) is to this effect.

"The Rule, as it stands at present, appears to me to impose upon a Teacher the duty of teaching the Scripture lesson, and Sacred poetry, whether he will or no: when we come to deal with this question, we shall be involved in very serious embarrassment."—p. 195.

Dilemmas of this sort are as bad for the moral as for the religious character of the teachers, a class whose influence and example must tell very much upon the population at large.*

* "The Schoolmaster—whether he have to teach the letters of the alphabet to a class of little children, or the elements of physical science to a meeting of young mechanics—has in every case, an object in view, with which these and the like lessons may indeed be combined, but to which they must ever be subservient. In every case he has to educate the religious instinct, to guide opinion in morals, and to impart a knowledge of revealed truth—a knowledge the most sublime that can by possibility become matter of instruction, which yet must form a part of the most rudimental teaching." (*Second Letter, &c.*, by the Rev. Derwent Coleridge, p. 50.) It hardly seems consistent with these high functions that the schoolmaster should be the person to set an example of disobedience to the wishes of his Church.

"Considering the restrictive principle of the System in relation to religious instruction, and the anti-Catholic spirit in which it is administered, it cannot be matter of surprise that Catholic Teachers, whose promotion is entirely in the hands of the Inspectors, should fear to exhibit any appearance of religious zeal in the discharge of their school duties. . . . The emancipation of the Teacher from clerical control is one of the aims of the system, and, misled by the pernicious influences to which they are subjected, too many of the schoolmasters, in foolish conceit, have swerved from that allegiance and respect which are due to the pastors, and not alone on the grounds of religion, but also as their employers". . . . "While a paid monitor, from twelve to sixteen years of age, this Catholic lad had been the mere creature of the Inspector, who fined him, disgraced him, removed him, promoted him, voted the Teacher a gratuity for his instruction, or disallowed it. At sixteen or seventeen years of age his Inspector sends him to a District Model School, where he is a boarder, under one or more resident Protestant Teachers, his fellow-boarders in every case being of different creeds: the least objectionable aspect of their domestic life is the entire absence of distinction, or notice of any religious practice whatever as a portion of their daily personal duties". . . . "The Catholic Pupil-Teacher, now eighteen or nineteen years of age, proceeds to complete his course of education, to the Marlborough Street Institution. Thus are the professional aristocracy of the Catholic National Teachers now raised, the creatures of the State, brought up, at the most important periods of their lives, apart from the Church, and if preserved from indifference or hostility towards her, it is by supernatural means, and from no merit in the system under which they are trained. These being the most accomplished teachers, obtain the best endowed institutions under local patrons, appointments in Model Schools, Colonial offices, Clerkships, Organizerships, and in many cases, Inspectorships."—pp. 218-19.

The Dissenting communities, like the Church of England, train their teachers in such a way as to make them the best representatives of the sect to which they belong, and a due link of connection between the intellectual and the religious element included in it. This is as it should be. No Catholic would wish it to be otherwise. Surely in spite of sectarian prejudice, a similar advantage might be conceded to Catholics. To rule by dividing is a principle carried too far when divisions are sown between the teachers and the pastors belonging to the same Church. Teachers are disqualified for their function by a System which does violence to their conscience.

System, we now proceed to its actual working. No system which is unfit for the Catholics in Ulster, can, so long as it remains unreformed, be worthy of the imposing name of 'National.' The Presbyterians have effected some curious modifications of it. The National System has been hitherto complained of as an irreligious one. Our readers will find that, so far as Presbyterian interests are concerned, it is in one sense so religious that schools, under Presbyterian patrons, are used as "meeting houses." The series of concessions seem to have originated so long ago as 1840, when, in reply to the Rev. Dr. Steward, the Board wrote:

"1st. Any lectures or addresses, whether accompanied with prayer and singing or not, connected with the religious instruction of the children attending the National School, would not be regarded as a violation of the Rule. 2ndly. That the attendance of the *parents of the children*, or *their connections*, during such lecture or address, would not render it a violation of the rule. 3rd. That in the opinion of the Board, such lecture or address, being given by a clergyman of any denomination, or by a layman, makes no difference."—p. 114.

The following is the Rev. Dr. Cooke's statement.

"When we have built our own school-houses, we insist upon, and receive, the right of having *every use of them*, out of school-hours or school-days; whereby I mean that we may have them for Sabbath schools, or we may have them for week-evening meetings, for prayer, or for preaching, at our discretion."—p. 115.

The Rev. T. Campbell gives evidence thus:

"Are you aware whether or not it is in conformity with the Rules of the Board to deliver lectures, and give religious instruction to the pupils, at which the parents and friends of the pupils can attend, and are invited to attend?—It is; *but I am aware that under the guise of doing so they are open to the public.....* Such a practice may be in conformity to the concessions lately granted to the Presbyterians; but I take it to be *in direct opposition to the original Rules of the Board.*"—p. 117.

The Rule, as amended in 1855, permits such use of a school, with the single and obviously useless reserve, that it is not to be employed as the "*stated place of worship of any religious community.*" The locality of the school, and its usages, are of course perfectly well known; there is, consequently, no necessity for making any *public statement*, in order to render it available for those in the neighbourhood. There happens, however, to be one other

provision which effectually prevents Catholics, if so disposed, from using their schools as district chapels. The erection of an altar, and the celebration of sacraments, are prohibited in schools. The Sacrifice of the Mass is therefore inadmissible; while prayer, preaching, psalmody, and congregational attendance, all that is necessary for ordinary Presbyterian worship, are permitted. We have no wish that our schools should be used as Catholic chapels; but the distinction here made speaks for itself. Its tendency is thus indicated.

“This use of the schools as *District Meeting Houses*, is not confined to rural localities, but appears to be most generally practised where churches and meeting houses are most numerous, namely, in Belfast and its vicinity.....The patrons of many of these schools are, landlords, mill-owners, employers, clergymen, and persons whose position and wishes influence the Catholic tenants, mechanics, labourers, and struggling classes, and the Catholic children, once permitted to join in the daily instruction from Protestant teachers, or clergymen, during the ordinary hours, the evening lecture, and the psalmody, or prayer meeting, held in the same school room, a few hours later, can present no aspect so revolting as to scare their attendance.”—p. 122-3.

We shall now turn the page and look at the Catholic side of National Education in Ulster. The result of the evidence we shall quote amounts to this, that Catholic children are sent to places which, under the name of schools, are probably better adapted to the purpose of making the pupils Protestants, or bad Catholics, than they could be if avowed meeting-houses. In our list of changes we have already referred to one which was conceded after a protracted fight, that change, namely, which cancelled the original rule, relative to the removal of children when religious instruction opposed to the faith of their parents was being imparted, and left it to each individual parent to withdraw his child, exonerating managers, patrons, and teachers, from responsibility in the matter. Every body knows that however exaggerated may be the charge of exclusiveness; commonly brought against Catholics, they at least are not latitudinarians. Catholic parents so far resemble Protestant parents, that they wish to see their children brought up in their own faith, and consequently do not wish that they should derive their religious instruction from persons of an opposite one. But most persons are also aware

that the right of "private judgment" in this matter is by no means conceded to Catholic parents by multitudes of Protestant landlords, agents, clergymen, and other influential persons; and that too often the severest pressure is used, in order to induce them to consent to their children's receiving Protestant instruction. Let us now see how far the wishes of parents have been carried out in schools from which pastoral authority has been banished under the specious plea of vindicating parental.

The following is the evidence of Mr. McCready.

"Do you believe that in point of fact the Roman Catholic children attending the Presbyterian schools are directed to withdraw, by putting up the board, giving notice when the Bible is read?—It is required by the rules of the Board that they should have such notice given to them, but *not that they should be directed to withdraw*. Do you believe that Roman Catholic children do withdraw when the Bible is read?—Not universally; in many parts of the North of Ireland the Roman Catholics read the Scriptures with the Protestant and Presbyterians, and *if they were left to themselves, I believe they would do so very generally*."—p. 98.

The "Bible" means the Protestant Version; and by "left to themselves" Mr. McCready seems to mean left without pastors, or pastoral advice. What Protestant children in similar circumstances might do, under Catholic landlords, equally exacting, he does not inform us.

The following is the testimony of Dr. Cooke, one of the chiefs of the Presbyterian body.

"Do these Roman Catholics generally continue in the school at the time of prayer?—*I think they all do*. And during the time of the reading of the Scriptures, in the course of the secular education, do they also attend?—As far as I know, they not only are present, but read the Scriptures as readily as the other children do.".....—p. 99.

Evidence of the like nature is given by the Rev. C. King Irwin, who remarks:

"My impression is, that Presbyterian ministers and masters manage their schools just as they please, in total disregard of theological rules," and "in almost every instance where I asked the question, 'Was the Bible read by all, or did any object,' the answer was, 'none object.'"—p. 100.

The 'theoretic' rule is, that the parents' wishes should be carried out; and that rule is disregarded for the simple

reason that the practical rule, by which it would have been enforced, has been repealed.

A. G. Stapleton, Esq. enquires of the Rev. Dr. Edgar, the Systematic Divinity Professor in the General Assembly's College, at Belfast, as to the cause of so remarkable a phenomenon. With great frankness Dr. Edgar answers him thus :

"The Presbyterian schools are connected with the National Board, on their own conditions. They make it a rule to read the Scriptures in all the schools, and the Roman Catholics attend them."—p. 101.

But the most incontestable evidence on this subject is that of an Inspector of the Board itself; and this brings us to the celebrated case of Mr. Keenan and the "suppressed portion of a Report." It is referred to in the Catholic Case Stated," (p. 109.) and at more length by the same author in his pamphlet entitled "Mixed Education"—the "Catholic Case and its Catholic Advocate vindicated." We quote from the latter (p. 44).

"In his General Report (Board's 22nd Report, vol. ii. p. 49.) Mr. Keenan states that in the year 1855 he had regularly visited 44, and incidentally visited upwards of 150 other schools, from which, coupled with his official intercourse with the District Inspectors and others; he had 'frequent opportunities afforded him of becoming intimately acquainted with the exact state of education in most parts of his circuit,' which embraced the whole, or portions of seven of the nine counties of Ulster, and contained upwards of 1000 National Schools. This Report extends to seventy-five pages, and discusses every feature in the working of the schools, with the exception of their practices, as to *separate Religious Instruction*, and this, which was struck out by the National Board, I now submit, from the Parliamentary Paper that has been issued, since the publication of the 'Catholic Case.'"

Mr. Keenan describes *five* different practices in the National Schools of Ulster. The fifth is set forth as that

"Where the Teacher and *part* of the Pupils were of *different* denominations, and the Teacher gave a *common* religious instruction to *all*, *none of them retiring.*" This fifth practice "was confined exclusively to schools which were conducted by Protestant (*Presbyterian*) Teachers. In *all* the schools which I visited in Belfast, which were taught by Presbyterian Teachers, and in which there was a *mixed* attendance, *this practice prevailed*; indeed, it is pretty general throughout the counties of Antrim and Londonderry, but I never

observed it to prevail in any other part of the country. By this practice Religious Instruction is *separate as to time*, from the ordinary literary business of the school, but not as to a distinction of the denominations, whilst religious instruction is going on. I have brought these different practices *already* under the notice of the Board in my *ordinary* Reports upon the Schools, and have therefore no occasion to enter further into them here. Rule 16, section iv. (as to 'Notice to Parents,') was not in operation until the end of last year, but the Rules *then in force* relating to Religious Instruction, and parental right, were in all cases complied with."

The Catholic children thus educated in religion by Protestant Teachers, appear to have exceeded 11,000 in number.* For excluding the above passage from Mr. Keenan's Report, as laid before Parliament and the country, the Board assigns the following reason :

"The above passage from Mr. Keenan's Report was omitted by direction of the Commissioners, because, in the year 1855 the Commissioners had passed their new Rule, on the subject of Religious Instruction, for the purpose of preventing the possibility of any child, in a National School, attending Religious Instruction given by a teacher of a different faith from that of the child's parent, without that parent being fully apprized of the fact; but it was not until some time (above three weeks) after Mr. Keenan had closed his inspection of the Ulster Schools, that the forms of 'Notice to Parents' alluded to in the Board's Rule, part I, sect. iv. para. 16, and the object of which was to secure the free exercise of parental authority in the matter of Religious Instruction, were issued to Teachers for the use of their schools. The Report of Mr. Keenan itself, from which the passage was expunged, in which the practices of some northern schools, as regards Religious Instruction, are commented on, did not reach the office until the 14th day of July, 1856, at which date the new Rule had been at least six months in operation, and must, therefore, it was presumed, have brought the government of the Schools in conformity, in this matter, with the Board's Rules."—Catholic Case and its Catholic advocate vindicated, p. 45.

This vindication Mr. Kavanagh condemns in severe terms, on four different grounds: 1st, Because, although the new Rule was directed to be brought into operation on the 1st Dec. 1855, yet no sooner was it issued than it

* The Eglinton Returns show that so far back as 1852 the Catholic pupils in Presbyterian schools were 11,335. They are now, according to Mr. Kavanagh, 'not far short of 20,000.'

was objected to by the Presbyterians; and the Board yielded to their objections, and issued a Circular, stating that the New Rule was not to apply to any children who had already been attending the instruction complained of, but only to such as should do so *for the first time* subsequently to the issue of the notice. The Rule being thus modified, there remained nothing to prevent thousands of Catholic children from continuing *for several years* longer to receive Protestant instruction. 2ndly, He quotes Mr. Keenan to prove that "the notice-system is a mere sham." 3rdly, He shows that the notice, such as it is, applies, even prospectively, only to some out of the many cases in point. It runs thus :

"If any child of a religious persuasion *different from that of the Teacher* of any National School, attend during the time or times set apart for religious instruction given by such Teacher, it shall be his, or her duty, on the *first attendance* of every such child, during the time for such religious instruction, given by such Teacher in such school, forthwith to notify the same to the parent or guardian of such child, on and by a form, to be furnished by the Commissioners."—Cath. Case, p. 110.

From this it appears that "if a clergyman, or any person other than the teacher, gives the religious instruction, no notice need be sent." Still less need a notice be sent if the teacher be a Catholic, which is quite compatible with the religious instruction coming from a Presbyterian patron, who is asserted to select such teachers occasionally, "to allure the Catholic pupils to the Bible class." 4thly, The notice need only be sent once. If the attendance of the child be discontinued for a time, and subsequently resumed, it does not appear that any fresh notice need be sent. Various tricks are alluded to by which the notice can be rendered nugatory.

"Assuming even that the child is told by his parents not to attend the Teacher's religious instruction again, how can unsuspecting childhood see harm in it? If it be given as the first lesson, he arrives at school when it is going on, and he joins; it rains, or it is cold, and he takes shelter in the school, while it proceeds; if the last lesson, he has a distance to go, and he either joins or must listen, while waiting for his Protestant or Presbyterian companion or neighbour: these, the example of the teacher, the sympathy of numbers, or a hundred other circumstances attract the child to join in the lesson."—p. 113.

We shall join in no discussion as to the motives of the Board in this matter. It is fortunate in having escaped, on this occasion, the keen analysis of Archdeacon Stopford, its late 'Assailant' and present 'Panegyrist.' It is with facts that we deal. Very clever pleas are offered to our consideration no matter what we complain of. Have we not a right, like the prophet of old, to appeal to the senses, and ask, "What meaneth, then, this bleating of sheep in mine ears?" We do not want excellent reasons for our children being brought up in Protestant teaching: we want that they should be brought up in the faith of their fathers, no matter how unphilosophically. We want that this should be effected uniformly, and by means of self-acting Rules, *the only rules fit for Ireland*, and irrespectively of the amount of watchfulness which may prevail on one side, or of proselytizing zeal, on the other, at any particular period. Have we not reason to be on our guard when we find the (changed) National System advocated on such grounds as these?—

"Where the Church children are very few, it is invariably found that the system of the Church Education Society, even in the most diligent hands, cannot take any hold of the Roman Catholic population. * * * If the Clergy, or even the landlords are in future to have any connection with the education of the bulk of the lower orders in these countries, it must be by means of some other system of Schools than that of the Church Education Society." (Archdeacon Stopford's Report, &c. p. 4.)

Well may he say, "the original system of the Board was evil;" but say also "a new system has been grafted on the former."

Parental authority! What we complain of is, that under the plea of protecting parents from pastors, the wishes of both alike are despised. If any doubt can really be entertained on the subject by unprejudiced persons, what could be so simple as to require that before the religious education of any Catholic child is placed in the hands of a Protestant clergyman or schoolmaster, the written or verbal consent of the Catholic parent should previously be obtained for a proceeding so extraordinary? The *consent* of the parent would speak for itself. The absence of *dissent* proves nothing. He may never have received the message: his answer may never have been received: the notice despatched may have been unintelligible to him; or its meaning may have been misrepresented by the

bearer. At all events every one knows that the Irish peasant is under pressure upon those subjects, and that a merely negative course is the one that recommends itself to timidity, procrastination, and dulness. His landlord, or the agent, may assure him that no proselytism shall be allowed at the school, meaning that the child shall be brought up in the Lutheran doctrine of Justification, but that no direct attempt shall be made towards a premature discussion on specially Catholic doctrines and practices, which, their centre having been removed, will hang loose, like dead leaves on a wintry bough, the sport of every blast. He may add, "if after this solemn assurance you withdraw your child, you tell me distinctly that I am a liar and a cheat!"*

The whole of Ireland is full of proofs that this coercive pressure exists. It exists in the Church Education Schools, and in the Mission Schools, which make no attempt to conceal their proselytising aim. We rejoice to be able to think that a mode of proceeding, in itself so immoral, proceeds in many instances from a wide-spread misconception. Again and again Clergymen affirm their belief that the Irish people wish for such Scriptural instruction as they give them, and that they are only restrained by fear of their priests from gladly receiving instruction in the Protestant Bible! This curious notion is amusingly brought out in the following passage taken from Mr. Trench's Digest of Evidence, 1855. (p. 259.)

* It is not zeal, or even Proselytism that we complain of, but the enthusiasm, or party spirit, which divorces these from charity, and which advocates supposed Truth by unjust or indirect means. The very kindest relations may exist between those who labour for each other's conversion. Would that Mr. Woodward's words might find way to men not more sincere Protestants than himself. "I have ever thought that, as things are, if our first and permanent object were to benefit Roman Catholics and their children, the best way of effecting this would be by redoubled efforts to train up our own children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Thoughts on the Points at issue, p. 11.) Indifference as to other Persons being in the Truth not only is not allied to charity, but is a serious offence against charity, and one commonly founded either upon latent scepticism, or upon that contempt for Truth which belongs to practical materialism. It is but the *illicit* courses connected with missionary love and zeal that disturbs households, and confuses the spiritual sphere.

"Do you mean that they refuse to admit a child into their schools whom they have no power of compelling to listen to the instruction (i. e. religious) they offer?—They will not admit any child into their schools who *requires compulsion* on this matter; they do not compel the children to come to their schools, but still they come, knowing what they have to find there. *You cannot call that compulsion.*"

Considering that the child too often 'knows what he will find there,' in more senses than one, and that the parent occasionally knows what he may 'find,' if he does not let his child go there, this sentence suggests, at least to a Catholic, the idea of quite a newly invented sort of pressure, by which people are compelled to do what they dislike, and yet to do it "without compulsion!" To those who seriously regard their Catholic fellow-countrymen as the reluctant slaves of a tyrannical priesthood, of course the whole thing wears another aspect. Let them but act to the children of others, as they would wish their own children to be dealt by, and the delusion will leave them.

Among those most deeply involved in this delusion we must class Archdeacon Stopford, judging from his recent "Letter to the Right Honourable Alexander Macdonnell." It is written in part to repudiate what he seems to consider a charge brought against him in "The Catholic Case Stated," viz., that he had affirmed that an important rule, changed at his instance, had, previous to that change, enacted that Catholic children should be excluded by the patron from religious instruction of a kind opposed to the faith of their parents. We should have imagined that he would have thought the statement in question a high compliment to him. He appears, however, to deny that any such change of rule was made, either at his instance or irrespectively of it, maintaining that the original rule was "capable of either interpretation," and that nothing more than the clearing up of an ambiguity was needed or effected. Verbally he may be right. Morally very few persons will agree with him. The matter at issue was one of no less moment than this—whether managers of schools were, or were not, bound to exclude Catholic children when a species of instruction intentionally dangerous to their faith was going on. We have the plainest evidence of Mr. Blake and Mr. McCreed to prove how the Rule was originally under-

stood, as well as Archdeacon Stopford's own statements. Mr. Kavanagh, in reply to his recent letter, refers to a pamphlet of the Archdeacon's, published at the end of 1847, just after the change of rule had been effected, in which he says:

"The Board had themselves raised the question," (as to the interpretation of the rule,) "They had formerly gone beyond the most objectionable sense of the Rule. They had affirmed that it was of the *essence* of these Rules that the *patron should exclude from religious instruction all who were not actually directed by their parents to remain.*"—(The "Catholic Case and its Catholic Advocate vindicated," p. 85.)

The following is one of Archdeacon Stopford's plain statements in 1844.

"I have shown that the Rules bound the Patron to this course at least, (that of *excluding* children from religious instruction which their Parents forbade their attending,) if not to that stated by Lord Clancarty, up to 1843; that the Trust Deeds still bind him to it; that the ninth Rule (concerning notification) *positively*, and the third Rule possibly (although not probably,) require it still."—Report on the Schools of Meath, p. 70.

But it is not with this matter that we are chiefly concerned. The present Rule exists, and certainly it is *not* equivocal. When it was introduced, by whom, or under what plea, or to gain what object, is nothing to us. The Rule is highly injurious to us, and is diametrically opposed to the principles of Mr. Stanley's letter. Archdeacon Stopford, notwithstanding vindicates it, and on what grounds? On the ground of "Parental Right" versus "Pastoral Right."* He says:

* Archdeacon Stopford, to do him justice, has himself tolerably exalted notions respecting the teaching power of the clergy, as regards the problem of education. "I am persuaded this age will never find rest, nor peace, nor truth, until we set about to deduce from principles of truth, rules of action, suited to the existing necessities and circumstances of society.....It is painful to see how easily public men fall in with the tendency of the age—short-sighted and degenerate as it is.....It is painful too, to observe how this tendency is sometimes treated by the guides of conscience.....It is not enough that we keep ourselves clear. As ambassadors of God, as teachers of the state, we should testify to the principles on which rules should act. It is not enough to tell

"Mr. Kavanagh, writing under the superintendence of the four Catholic Archbishops, and 'in obedience to a call from the Church,' steps forward to demand that the State shall interfere to give the priest a compulsory power over the parent in respect of the education of his child. This is the question raised in the 'Catholic Case.' Priestly authority fails, and demands temporal support." (Letter to the Rt. Hon. A. Macdonnell, p. 13.) "The Priests have failed to control the parent's liberty, and it is demanded through Mr. Kavanagh that the State shall do it for them." (Ibid. p. 15.) "Power must be conferred by the State on Priests, to compel those parents whom they cannot persuade." (Ibid. p. 17.)

Again and again these assertions are reiterated. Perhaps their most unscrupulous expression is found in a passage in which the Archdeacon takes upon himself to set forth the aims of the Catholic clergy.

"We therefore demand, as absolutely necessary, that legal power be given us by the State, to withdraw the children against their own will, and the will of their parents." (Ibid. p. 20.)

them what a Christian state ought to be and to do. A description of what this world should be is but a poor guide to one who seeks his path through its tangled snares. We must look at facts as they are, and say how men should deal with them." (The Terms of Aid to Non-vested Schools. 1847. pp. 21-2.) To "teach the nations" only, requires but the sacerdotal function in its plenitude, with the Apostolic succession, authentic orders, mission and jurisdiction. To teach *States* also, and that with reference to the most arduous questions of mixed religious, ethical and political science, in which they have to deal not only with great principles, but with the application of these to the most complicated circumstances, requires a profound casuistry besides. The depositories of these astonishing functions are the clergy of the Irish branch of the United Church of England and Ireland. This is an interesting statement. We shall not contest it. But does not the Archdeacon think that, in this case, the clergy of a Church which has been in Ireland ever since St. Patrick's time, may have some trivial functions also? It may not be theirs, like the Jesuits of old, to direct "shortsighted and degenerate" statesmen, nor to sit in the tribunal of conscience when states or kings want direction; but may they not advise a peasant of their own flocks as to the religious character of a lesson book, or the wisdom of letting their children learn their faith from Protestant pastors—say, from the Archdeacon himself? As for the State, it may of course be the client, or the tool, of any counsellor it approves. We should have thought it however quite aware that it had already gone far enough in the way of theological legislation.

We should have thought it sufficient to deprive the clergy of rights guaranteed to them, without at the same time casting against them imputations insulting and gravely injurious. These statements have a practical character, as appears from the following warning, in which we are reminded of a cry which has never long slept from the time of Titus Oates and the Gordon Riots to that of Catholic Emancipation, and of which the peasant has again and again been the victim—" *Let Statesmen look to our civil and religious liberties.*" (p. 19.)

Archdeacon Stopford has been ill-advised. He writes with much logical point, and still more rhetorical skill; but facts are against him. Even as regards Mr. Kavanagh's book, we remember but one single charge out of the many score which he brings against the National System, (one which we have not quoted, and do not agree with,) to which the Archdeacon's strictures can with plausibility be applied. As to the assertions of the latter with respect to the Catholic clergy, the meaning of which is that they are tyrants, and that their people are their reluctant slaves, to coerce whom they vainly invoke the power of the State, we shall not descend to answer railing with railing. We content ourselves, therefore, with stating that the accusations upon which he has adventured are not true. The Catholic clergy do not find fault with the present National System because under it the State refuses to enforce their authority upon reluctant parents. Mr. Stanley's original provision did not *enforce* their authority; but it *recognised* it as an existing fact, and allowed a legitimate sphere for its exercise upon such as chose to acknowledge it. They object to the present system because a docile and devout flock can no longer procure for their children the *opportunity* of receiving from their pastors, or "persons delegated by them," that religious instruction which was originally guaranteed to them in all schools; while on the other hand successive changes of Rule have taken away from Catholic parents that security which they once enjoyed against the imparting of heterodox teaching to their children. Permit the Catholic priest to enter the school, as he was originally entitled to do, for the purpose of giving instruction to his own children. We think there is extremely little danger of their not receiving it; and if such a contingency should arise, he will no more lodge his complaint with "the State" than with

the Emperor of China, or the Royal Academy. He would have no such power of appealing to the State under the Denominational System. As regards the Protestant religious instruction given in the Non-vested schools, we have already stated that what we require is, that the wishes of parents should be tested fairly, and not in a deceptive mode. Throughout the whole of his pamphlet "parental authority" is Archdeacon Stopford's battle-cry. The advocates of the new Rule maintain that parents are with them. Very well! But is there any reason why this matter should not be tested? Let the *direct* written or verbal consent of the parents be obtained. The mystification will then have come to an end. Suppose the parent explicitly to *refuse* his consent, what then? Will the Archdeacon take care that parental wishes are held sacred? Nothing of the sort. He says in his recent pamphlet, (p. 12.) (and more distinctly still in his pamphlets of 1844, and of 1847, and in his evidence,) "Those who conscientiously disapprove of the parent's conduct cannot become his instruments to execute for him what they think wrong." Away then with this sonorous declamation about parental authority! The advocates of the Church Education schools hold in principle the same view of the matter as Archdeacon Stopford. We cannot but greatly prefer their line of action as indicated by the Right Hon. Joseph Napier, in a letter to the Rev. J. Mac Ivor, published in the year 1850. He says, "We should be honest and conscientious in whatever plan we accredit, or defend. I cannot go with those who profess to treat the Church of Rome on terms of equal claim to assistance in Education, and yet in secret, and by the contrivance of policy, hope eventually to undermine her foundations." "Pastoral," not "parental" authority is the right word! Only it should be explained to mean the authority of Protestant pastors to educate Catholic children in a religion opposed to that held by their parents!*

* In his "Report" of 1844, Archdeacon Stopford speaks unequivocally as to what he calls "exaggerated" views of parental right. "A parent may prohibit his child learning those commandments of God which, at his Baptism, he promised to keep.... Such a prohibition, even from a parent, we hold to be of no moral obligation whatsoever." (p. 78.) So again, in his pamphlet of 1847, he

It is very well for clerical disputants, whose allies are the newspapers, to pray in aid that big word "Ultramontanism," that polemical refuge of the destitute, in which bankrupt argument and blind animosity so often (now that the real meaning of the term is forgotten,) take sanctuary. But would these gentlemen have nothing to say if they found Catholic landlords and Priests obtruding Douay Testaments upon their Protestant parishioners? The principle of parental versus pastoral authority is not a weapon of *defence*, or there would be no objection to it, but of offence. It is to remain a dead letter as regards Protestants; it is a reality as regards Catholics. It is to be exercised on their behalf, but against their will; in defence of their liberty, but by men whom they distrust. It is advocated upon a principle (private judgment) which is to deliver them from spiritual bondage; but they regard the supposed bondage as a "glorious liberty," or they need not have suffered persecution for centuries on account of it; and the proffered freedom in matters of faith they regard as "license," the nomadic liberty of wandering tribes, who are free indeed to change their encampment every day,

says, "Were that child persuaded in his own mind, and capable of understanding, that he was bound to hear the Word of God, although prohibited by his earthly parent, and were he to present himself in my scripture class, I would admit him: that would not be interference with the child's religious persuasion. His persuasion would be an accomplished fact without my interference. Nor would it involve any violation of my obligation to the parent, as defined in my application to the Board."—(The terms of Aid to Non-vested Schools, by Archdeacon Stopford. (p. 51.) 1847. Grant and Bolton.) With the last sentence we are sorry to agree. From the rest of the statement we differ. We consider children thus used to be trapped, and their parents also. May we not ask how, except by having been *already induced* to discard the authority, both of his parent and his pastor, for that of a stranger, can a young child arrive at convictions in favour of what, under the name of the "Word of God," really means the Protestant Version of the Holy Scriptures, as well as Protestant instruction in them, and at Protestant views respecting the *particular place* assigned to the Bible in the scheme of Redemption, and the education of the human race? Every instructed person knows that the question at issue is not as to the value of the Sacred Scriptures, but as to their Rule of *interpretation*; not as to the preciousness of the treasure, but as to the key of the treasure-house.

but who have cut themselves off from the advantages of a stable home, and from the extended powers, as well as the ennobling restraints which belong to civilized communities in religion. If men want to know what 'parental right' really means, let them learn of Dr. Doyle, a prelate of a Church commonly accused of exclusiveness. For the schools in his diocese he drew up regulations providing for all Catholic children a thoroughly religious course of instruction, and enacting as follows for Protestants present in them.

"Whenever Protestant children attend, let them not share in the duties of prayer or religious instruction, unless at their own desire, *sanctioned expressly by their parents*; and where the number of such children will be at all considerable, the committee, if required, should afford time and place for religious instruction being imparted to them by a person of *their own communion*, and in the manner *prescribed by their own pastors*!"

We have now passed in review the principal changes made in the National System; and our readers will perhaps agree with us that, since the Vicar of Wakefield's silk stockings were so often mended with worsted that they became worsted stockings, few systems have changed more signally. So far at least we agree with Mr. Trench's "Digest of Evidence," to which is prefixed Mr. Stanley's original letter, annotated in such a way as to prove that but a small proportion of its engagements are now carried out. What, then, is to be done? Is the Board resolved to stand still; and if so can it show any reason why, having been so long in motion, it should at this particular moment, rather than at any other, come to a full stop? It may indeed proclaim that to it now belongs the happy mission of "closing the cycle of revolutions;" it may nail its weathercock to the mast,—until the wind blows from some less suspected point—but it does not follow that a proceeding thus cautious will be a prudent one. Several of the Statesmen who served on the Select Committee of the House of Lords, in 1854, were disposed to take a bolder line, and the appendix of Mr. Trench's book includes not a few suggestions "intended to have been proposed" by them. Lord Granville's proposal touched one of the earliest and most fruitful deviations from the original principle of the Board. It proposed that "All religious instruction, whether denominational or general, given in the National Schools,

and not contained in the National school-books, must be given at a separate hour, and publicly notified in the timetable, under the head of Religious Instruction." (p. 295.) The Earl of Derby, instead of thus binding patrons more severely than at present, proposed to allow them more latitude, of course equally in the case of Protestant and Catholic patrons. Among his suggestions was the following:—(p. 299.)

"That the Board be authorised, if they shall think fit, to grant similar advantages to those enjoyed by the non-vested schools, to any schools now existing, or hereafter to be built, whatever their regulations as to religious instruction, the patrons of which shall be willing to place them in connection with the Board, to admit the Board's control over books to be used in general instruction, and to receive officially the visits of the Government Inspectors."

This is a further development of the principle introduced when non-vested schools were first admitted. Theoretically it would assist the schools of the Christian Brothers as well as those of the Church Education Society—supposing the Board to be fairly constituted. Practically it could by no means do so unless accompanied by a law, absolutely necessary for the fair working of ANY System in Ireland—a law analogous to that by which sites are now taken for Coast-guard stations. It would also be obviously essential, in order to prevent proselytism, to allow pupils in every Irish school, whether Catholic or Protestant, to avail themselves of its secular instruction, without being compelled, directly or indirectly, to receive its religious. This is the arrangement made in Trinity College, Dublin. The suggestions "intended to have been proposed" by the Protestant Bishop of Ossory, are drawn up with much ability. One of them seems conclusive against the far-famed principle of "parental authority." It says, (speaking of the schools under the "Church Education Society for Ireland, which are supported by not less than three-fourths of the clergy, and about the same proportion of the laity" of the Established Church in Ireland,) "It appears that, in regulating the religious instruction which they give in their schools, not by the requirements of the children in attendance upon them, *or of their parents*, or of the State, but by the dictates of their own judgment and conscience, the

Irish Church is acting upon the same principle on which all denominations in England, with which organized educational societies are connected, act; and that in England the State acquiesces in that principle,"... ..and furthermore, that in a petition presented by the Archbishop of Canterbury, "5,414 of the English clergy have testified, concerning their brethren in Ireland, that in their steadfast refusal to connect themselves with the National Board, under conditions which would prevent them from instructing in the Holy Scriptures every child in attendance, they have only acted in accordance with the principles of the Church, and in strict fulfilment of their ordination vows." (Digest of Evidence, &c., p. 303.) Every child in these Church Education Schools is required to receive from Protestant teachers instruction in the Protestant Bible, whether his parents approve it or disapprove it. If this be the principle sustained by three-fourths of the Irish Protestant clergy—specially eulogized by 5,414 of the English—acted on in England by all Protestant religious denominations—and there sanctioned by the State, the Bishop is but candid in disavowing the principle of parental authority.

The Bishop, notwithstanding, would provide, as he states, for the carrying out of the parent's wishes, by furnishing him with a large choice of schools. His plan is, that in all schools connected, or to be connected with the Board, the secular education is to be such as the Board sanctions, while the religious education is to be enforced upon all attending the school, and determined in character by the will of the patron. This suggestion, it might be supposed, would give to Catholics and Protestants, something like a separate education, under the name of the Mixed System. In practice, however, the scheme would probably work very unequally. The superior wealth of the Protestants would enable them to multiply their schools everywhere. Catholic children might be often induced, by moral pressure, to go into Protestant schools, which (the system being still theoretically a 'mixed' one,) would continue to bear the specious title of 'national;' and there an instruction decidedly Protestant would be forced upon them.* This

* Where no equivocal Rules give rise to misconception, the faith

scheme is at once very simple and very complex. *Professedly* it would continue to be the 'mixed' system:—it would be accorded, however, on the *supposition* that it was to *work* "denominationally;" while yet it might well be *expected* to turn back practically into the mixed system, but without the safeguards of that system! A Denominational System should be such *avowedly*: and a 'mixed' one should be preserved from the dangers of proselytism by Mr. Stanley's simple provision of a "combined secular, and a separate religious education." Lord Derby's suggestion would *add* the denominational to the mixed system: the Bishop of Ossory's would *blend* the two in a sort of chemical compound, by no means of a safe character. Paradoxically enough, it would strain to the utmost the 'conscientious' rights of Patrons; while it wholly ignored, not only the conscience of Parents, but also that of the State, which would be educationally endowing two opposed Religions at once. All changes are good and safe in proportion as they lean towards the freedom of education: but, under the circumstances of Ireland, no freedom ought ever to be conceded to patrons which can limit the freedom of pupils. There is no reciprocity in this matter. Catholics do not consider education to be a legitimate means of conversion; and they do respect the legitimate authority of parents, whether Catholic or Protestant.

Our own remedy for admitted evils we have stated, supposing the door not yet closed against Reform. That remedy consists in reverting to the original principles of Mr. Stanley's letter, and either doing away with most of the changes which have since taken place, or, where that may be impossible by reason of privileges already guaranteed to Protestants, in that case giving to Catholics equivalents by which the original promise may be kept

of the Catholic child (and we are as much bound not to expose one child, as a thousand children, to danger) is seldom imperiled for any long time. Some ten or twelve years ago, the Church Education Schools boasted the attendance of about 50,000 Catholic children—whose faith, of course, was not to be interfered with, though they were to be instructed in the Protestant Bible. That number was, before very long, reduced to 13,000;—since which the National System is generally supposed to have been rising in the opinion of the Church Education Society.

in the spirit, if not in the letter. One of these equivalents we have indicated in our suggestion respecting the vexatious difficulties as to sites for schools, by which the best efforts of the State may be rendered nugatory, alike under the Mixed or the Separate System. Most earnestly do we hope that not only party spirit and personal interests may be set aside in the discussion of so solemn a subject, but that those who take part in it may remember that they are dealing with one of the deepest problems of moral, as well as of political philosophy, and may allow no more than a due weight to any considerations of a merely temporary character. Great principles may be modified in their application so as to meet the exigency of circumstances, but nothing can justify us in the maintenance of unsound principles. This applies pre-eminently to the State. Nothing can on the long run be for the interest of the State if it militates against the moral and spiritual well-being of any who compose the nation. The nation cannot help being composed of various religious bodies; but it can avoid aggravating jealousies by partiality and intolerance. The nation has lost the supernatural gift of religious unity; it need not throw away that which is next best, the natural and noble emulation of different religious communities, each of which should desire, not to depress its neighbour, but to enkindle its ardour in the race of piety and patriotism. It is freedom of education which admits of this generous rivalry. The principle of emulation, even in matters exclusively religious, produces such benefits that many writers have referred to it as an a priori proof that it cannot be by a single authoritative standard, but by the rival efforts of individuals or sects, that Religious Truth is to be ascertained. Of course we do not admit this statement, for we believe that the very word "Revelation" means that Truth has been already communicated to the Human Race; and that our ordinary duty is no longer therefore to ascertain it, but to maintain it in its fulness at once and its purity, and to live by it. But we too admit that, unity once lost, it is by a frank and kindly emulation, not by a forced or apathetic indifference, that the cause both of religion and of civil good will most prosper. Surely, then, we may expect those who are never tired of extolling free trade and unshackled competition, not to become the devotees of uniformity in education. We are far from railing at system, for it

has its due place, but system may easily become a bondage. There is such a thing as worshipping our Net, and burning incense to our Drag. A means to an end is not to be venerated as an end. Those who most ardently believe in "Mixed Education" might, we think, prove their confidence in their principles much better by allowing equal advantages to the Queen's Colleges, and to the Catholic University, and thus permitting their respective merits to be fairly tested, than by heaping endowments on the former and denying a charter to the latter.

The best things are those which, like the British Constitution, have grown up by the correction of abuses, and by adaptation to circumstances. The National System developed very soon into the freer and larger principle of Non-vested schools. Why should its admirers conclude that it is incapable of an analogous development now, but of one protected from those abuses by which the earlier change has been discredited? Is it even certain that two systems of education, the Mixed and the Denominational, could not co-exist in the same country, each assisted by the State, but the latter in a slight degree only? If so, what is the reason of this? It must be because *all parties* would concur, even at a serious pecuniary loss, in one thing at least, viz., a preference for the Denominational System. This is a strong statement. A system which no party in England would endure is, in this case, supposed to be now *forced* upon Ireland, where no party approves of it! We by no means make such a statement: we can easily see in each system of education much which would recommend it to many. It may be that the two systems, supposing them to be secured against the two classes of abuse, proceeding from exaggerated State-influence on the one hand, and from proselytising zeal on the other, would work better than either of them separately; each keeping the other in a wholesome check, and supplying that in which its rival was defective. On this, however we have no desire to dogmatize; but we implore our friends also to be incredulous as to the dogmatism of the State. A Mixed system which is to reconcile all parties, and yet which, according to its advocates, no party would accept if it had a choice, is an educational "comprehensiveness" which verges toward the transcendental regions of the incomprehensible. By all means let all persons be educated together who can be induced to

like that system—but none besides. Our Latitudinarian friends will not quarrel with us for rejecting only their narrowness. To bring people together is an excellent way of making them friends: granted—but occasionally when children quarrel they are separated. Moreover, other means might be imagined for doing away with old animosities in Ireland besides making rival disputants of eight years old cast up sums on the same slate.

We are not concerned at present to deal with the arguments commonly put forward against the *Separate System*, except so far as they are also arguments against any strenuous efforts for the reform of the present one. “Beware,” it is sometimes said to us by persons sincerely opposed to proselytism, “how you move in this matter. You stand on the brink of a precipice. If a Denominational System were established it might be nominally in favour of Catholics and Protestants alike; but in reality the latter would be allowed to make it their own. They are rich and you are poor. The grant for Irish education might easily be reduced so low that even if you got a fair proportion of it you could not support your schools. The contribution of the State would be made to bear an invariable ratio to the sums locally subscribed for each school. The landed proprietors and the Established Church could supply such large subscriptions in aid, that for every school of yours they would have three; and in each of these the education would be of a more costly and therefore of a higher character. You have numbers; but the numbers would not tell much on the Government contribution, unless the latter were made in the form of a capitation grant; and no doubt for that reason it would be awarded in some other manner. Moreover, it would be easy for the State to deny all aid except where a substantial and permanent school-house existed. For such school-houses the landlords already refuse sites in several counties in the north. Why should they not refuse them all over Ireland? What would you do where the Catholics were but few? Is it not plain that there you would have no schools; and that even in the southern provinces the Protestant schools would be far nearer to most of your children—each of them supported by the landlord, sanctioned by the State, and in character determinately proselytizing, yet not avowedly such?”

This statement is exaggerated in its tone, for it ignores the fact that no conceivable sums can ever effect more than a certain very small amount in the way of proselytism; the number of persons willing to sell their children being limited. It is just at first that these enterprises meet with whatever success attends them. In every society a certain degraded class exists. The favourite vice, owing to the circumstance of some particular locality, may be that of child-selling, with the intention of ultimately defrauding the purchasers. Very soon, however, the latter have bought up the whole of their small market, and discovered that while they appeared to be making rapid progress they were only, in electioneering phrase, "polling their good baronies." Next comes the reaction, and they commonly discover that the only permanent effect of their zeal has been to correct some local abuses, and substitute a vital and energetic for a sleepy Catholicism. That Catholicism, on the whole, has greatly gained by the attempts of the "Missions," is as certain as the loss sustained by some individual souls. With reference, however, to immediate consequences, the warning is certainly alarming—so alarming, however, that it is very far from making us contented with the present system, though willing to acknowledge that by an imprudent course we might exchange it for one more immediately dangerous. The statement seems to assume that the Protestants are never to join the present system in the southern provinces, by joining which they would of course acquire a large power over it. We believe the contrary: nor can we regret the prospect, because our desire is, not '*to play a game*' in Education, but to see all parties in possession of their rights, leaving consequences to God.* The statement also presupposes

* Many persons, both Protestants and Catholics, tell us that we should be contented with the present system, whatever its defects, because, in the three Southern Provinces, it has been left chiefly in our hands. This seems to us as little the argument of policy as that of principle. Has not every outcast child in Ulster a soul as well as the comparatively safe multitudes of Munster? Again, have not our Protestant fellow-countrymen as good a right as we have to the benefits, in the South, of a system for which they are taxed? If they exclude themselves from it at present

that, after all that has been said during half a century about civil and religious liberty, freedom of conscience, and the like, the proprietary class in a large part of Ireland, and the State, are ready to enter into a conspiracy for the purpose

that is their mistake : it is only wonderful that they should have persisted in it so long : we have no right either to wish that they should perpetuate their blunder, or to rest the religious security of our children upon its perpetuation. They have been warned again and again of that blunder by several of their ablest men. Any chance occasion,—the Pastoral itself—may furnish them with a plea for changing their course: and, in spite of the conscientious objections we have heard of for a quarter of a century, we may discover at any time that “The Bible and the whole Bible” was a cry, not a principle ; and find the State, and the State-Church once more in their natural harmony. Archdeacon Stopford, in his pamphlet of 1847, gave his brethren warning not to be too sure that the English system is the best for them. “Theoretically the system is one of perfect equality; practically it favours the majority.....The Government may favour such a system where the majority are of the State religion, a religion that naturally tends to support the imperial Government; that any essential good is gained by a different system in Ireland may be doubted.” (p. 36.) The Archdeacon might have added that in England the majority, and the wealth, happen to be at the same side. The Catholics there however, though poor and few, do not complain. He has already shewn that in the National system *as modified by the changes in the Rules*, the clergy of the Establishment possess the power of maintaining all over Ireland Protestant schools with Protestant teachers. “With respect to all children who are now, or hereafter may be, committed to you by their parents, your position would remain unchanged; you would continue to educate them for time and for eternity.....For children not so entrusted to you the Government have undertaken to provide secular education, and to employ teachers; leaving it to their parents to take care of their religious instruction. They are anxious that your object and theirs should agree; and with this view, those who administer the Government system are anxious to confer *their* office on the same individual *employed by you*.” (p. 15.) The Archdeacon proceeds: “it may be a matter of positive duty, and is deeply felt to be so by many conscientious men, to preserve in our hands the power of giving education its truly religious character to those who will so receive it, instead of throwing it into the hands of others, who will give it the stamp of error, or at best make it purely secular.” (p. 28.) A special reason for looking favourably on the National System he declares to be “that every change, almost without exception, was in

of assailing, in the most insidious form, the faith of that ancient and long-persecuted race by whose sweat and toil the landlords gain their wealth, and by whose valour the battles of that State are fought on sea and land. Is it

the right direction.....my only desire was to see those changes avowed and carried out." (p. 38.) Undue influence with children he says he would not use, but he adds, "There is a legitimate influence belonging to those who are really promoting, and directing intellectual activity—an influence inseparable from the successful performance of that duty—an influence which cannot be altogether separated from the persons who perform it, in their other relations to society." (p. 40.) So cogent is this reasoning that we cannot but believe that the Archdeacon's brethren must long since have regretted that they did not take his advice in time.

Mr. Mac Ivor, whose tone is generally friendly to us, in his pamphlet of 1850, assigns the same reasons for preferring the *changed* National System to any other. The right of Catholic parents to withdraw their children from Protestant religious teaching he vindicates on the unflattering ground that they "are not to be *required* either, all at once, to break through their conscientious belief, for the sake of obtaining some education for their children, or else to see them brought up as they have themselves been, in unmitigated Popery and social servitude, in material, and mental, and religious bondage.....Priests' or Popes' Interdicts *live* simply by the ignorance and superstition which causes them to be respected and obeyed. To remove the ignorance and superstition is the only effectual, as it is the only Christian way of condemning them to die. The National System proposes to us a large assistance in effecting this." (p. 20-1.) Again he remarks: "The Protestant clergy have a duty also to those who are, ever so conscientiously, *unwilling*. We ought to bring all our personal and ministerial influence to bear upon these, so as to place them also in connection with Scriptural truth." (p. 68.) Who could resist the following appeal:—"Let the National system be similarly judged, and let us see whether it be, *on the whole*, indifferent. As between Popery then, for instance, and Protestantism. 1. Is the nature and object of the Institution itself, the efficient diffusion of general education, equally favourable to both? 2. Is the 'large amount of religious, moral and useful instruction,' actually taught *before the hours* of special religious instruction, equally favourable to both?.....He is a strange Protestant who thinks so," (p. 72.) The practical application of all this is "Wherever the clergyman's exertions can now sustain one, generally weak, almost universally inefficient school, under the (Church Education) Society, he might have, if he chose, *one, two or three*, efficient schools under the Board." (p. 58-9.) No doubt, for if the Protes-

indeed so, and are so many years of professed liberality to have this sorry conclusion? We are convinced that a very large number of the proprietors would abhor such a course of persecution, and abhor it the more for being indirect; but let us assume that they would prove the minority, and be unable to influence the rest. Let us assume, also, that the State would allot to Ireland funds manifestly insufficient for so poor a country; that it would apportion those funds in the way most unfavourable to Catholicism; that it would attach to its contribution conditions impossible to be complied with; and that, finally, while it permits no rights of property to prevent the execution of a railway, it would allow all the highways of knowledge, of moral and of religious culture, to be closed against Catholics not prepared to abandon their faith.

If we are obliged to suppose all this, we must conclude that, under the present system also, our education is, to the last degree, insecure.* What could possibly

tant clergy join the system generally, it may easily happen that Building Grants will again be accorded to schools, though not vested in the Board. They will probably join it; and for this reason alone, as well as for higher ones, we maintain that no rules are safe for the South which are not fit for the North also. Our strength must be the strength that is in our principles.

* This theory seems to attribute to Parliament a mode of proceeding as unscrupulous as Archdeacon Stopford, in his Report of 1844, attributed to the National Board. He is surprised at such changes as he has described having been made while so little attention was attracted to them, and says, "It naturally leads one to consider how such great changes come to pass.....By what authority Lord Stanley's commission had been set aside. All these were matters of no small moment. 'Were we all asleep when all this was done?' is the thought that rises in every one's mind." (Report p. 38.) He accounts for the secrecy of the changes by a series of underhand proceedings deliberately planned by the Board, and executed with an entire disregard to the principles of honest dealing. "That deception which it is impossible to believe that the Board would have practised on the Lord Lieutenant, that very deception has been practised on Parliament and on the country." (Report p. 45.) Many pages are filled with the details of the proceedings which Archdeacon Stopford charges upon the Board, proceedings extending over a series of years, and affecting alike the government, the country, the Protestant clergy, and the Catholic

bring about such a conspiracy against the Irish people, on the part of those who are bound by duty, honour, and interest, to be their protectors? Obviously nothing but an ungovernable aversion to, and fear of, their religion. But we happen already to be largely in their power. If they cannot look on the great mass of our people otherwise than as religiously their enemies, they can only support the present National System so far as they consider it on the long run inimical to Catholicism. There are two modes of attack: that of storm and that of sap. The Church Missions prefer the former. This theory would suppose that others prefer the latter. The character of every system must depend mainly on the mode in which it is worked:—in the North, the predominant power, as regards the National System, is one divided between the landed proprietors, as patrons, and the State. Is the Hope of the peasant but as a fly caught between those two mailed hands? Yes, on this theory. If so, what follows, should we long retain the present system? Landlords frequently refuse sites even for National Schools if not Protestant in character. What is to prevent them from doing so always? Multitudes of Catholic national schools are consequently little better than hovels, leased from year to year. What is to prevent the Board from eventually refusing to give any aid, except where the school-house is such as we cannot make it? What is to prevent Model schools under the Board from being multiplied indefinitely, as the only alternatives to Non-vested schools under Protestant patrons? What is to prevent Model schools from establishing a latin class, and thus at once becoming intermediate schools? If a *bonâ fide* Catholic education for Catholics is indeed to be prevented, at any cost, our supposition is at least as natural as the one suggested to us. Our friendly monitors have thus succeeded in frightening us; but they have frightened us too much. They have convinced us that no system of education is safe which is administered by those who regard the recipients of it either as enemies, or as puppets. They have hinted that the remoter and more insidious danger may be the greater of the two. Passion is blind:

people. Those changes were all unfavourable to us; but we have referred them to no such base motives; and are equally unwilling to attribute evil designs to others.

Power is deaf: we cannot regard these as potentates fit to be entrusted finally with the education of our children. The argument that exhorts us not to leap down a precipice warns us also not to lie like Lotos-eaters upon a mud-bank before an advancing tide—and a mud-bank which is momentarily sinking beneath us. If there be such a thing as rashness, is there not also such a thing as a political Epicureanism contented to bear anything, whether of dishonour or of injury, so long as it is allowed to close its eyes to all dangers that are not in the immediate foreground? The warning we have alluded to is at least a conclusive argument to prove that a searching reform of existing abuses is necessary, if only to test the real dispositions of those who administer the National System. If, as it implies, the State considers us, not as it regards those whose education it aids in England, but simply as captives snared in its net, we ought to be made aware of the fact. We are unwilling to believe it. No doubt there were many who supported the “Catholic claims” merely because they fancied that Catholicism, as a religion, was dead. These persons, if consecutive, are of course aware that to repeal Catholic Emancipation is necessary before injustice can be pushed beyond a certain point. For our parts, we see something else in Ireland which would probably give way before the Act of 1829. But we cannot forget how many Protestants supported the Catholic claims, and made sacrifices for them, because they sincerely believed in the rights of conscience. These persons, at least, will sustain against unjust attack the rights they assisted us to win, and sustain them in their fulness.* They may not understand our

* Mr. Mac Ivor, who strongly asserts the rights of conscience, puts well the responsibility of those who, without wishing to do what is wrong, yet assist others to do it by co-operating with them in a *part* of their work. “You are not responsible either for the powers of nature, or the principles of the present British Constitution; but you are responsible for the part you act towards them, knowing them to be what they are, and being forewarned, and fully aware of the result which *will follow* from your voluntary proceeding.” (The proposed Modification of the Non-vested System, p. 41.) Those who sanction Rules which easily lend themselves to abuses, sanction those abuses; for as Mr. Mac Ivor says, “If you know the nature of the weapon, and are aware of the consequences of what you do, you are responsible for those consequences, though you *only* load the gun,” &c.-

position in detail; but they know generally that if we insist upon having for our children a system of education which will leave them Catholics and good Catholics, we are influenced by feelings exactly the same as those on which they act themselves every day. They must acknowledge that even when we cannot profit by their precept, we follow their example. Not only would they decline to send their children to Oscott or Stonyhurst, and that no matter what conditions might be made, or what material, or even moral, advantages might be held out to them there; but they would refuse to send them to Eton or Oxford, if the books used there were largely imbued with a Catholic spirit; if the teachers and the administration were predominately Catholic; if Protestant pastors were warned off the premises; if a nominal freedom were rendered nugatory by snares laid, or allowed to be laid, before the feet of unwary youth. What do we say? Are there not already persons who fear to send their sons to the ancient and venerable Universities of their land, because of Tractarianism?

It may be true that the more we endeavour to free ourselves from an unworthy and unsafe position, the more will some for whose rights we should have contended no less than for our own, endeavour to rivet our bonds. We shall, however, at least, know our friends from our enemies. The former will be fairly tested. With the latter, it can be no use to argue. They speak pretty plainly on the subject of idolatry, priestcraft, imposture, Babylon, and Antichrist. The land swarms with their Scripture readers, the lanes are littered with their tracts, and they receive, as they inform us, above £30,000 per annum from England, to assist their enterprises. They are often very amiable men; and, but for this unhappy enthusiasm, would be useful, and deservedly popular, members of society in their respective parishes. They seem to us, when they take the line we allude to, very mischievous persons; but what we regret about them chiefly is, that they are not Roman Catholics. Not being such, they see things from the particular level which they occupy on the Protestant ladder, and act accordingly. Their responsibility is chiefly as to the degree of sincerity, humility, and perseverance with which they have investigated the claims of that Church from which they still derive whatever they hold of Truth. We are bound to resist them: we have

neither the desire nor the right to judge them. The supporters of the Church Education Society, who have so long denounced the National System, are by no means, as they have recently informed the world, in favour of the Separate System! They mean apparently that they are contented with the Mixed System—provided they can have it all their own way. We cannot think that in this matter they have spoken quite candidly, or that they will be ultimately pleased with the line they have taken: but we are far from bearing them any ill will, and we hope that the creditable efforts which they have made to give their own children a religious education, directed by their *pastors*, may receive every assistance not injurious to the children of others. The State also, it is alleged, cannot trust us with the education of our children, except on condition that it is allowed to dilute the venom of our “ultramontanism.” We regret this circumstance, and think the State, in this case, very unwise. It forfeits the advantages it would derive from an education which, just in proportion as it is religious, will inculcate obedience to rulers, in the only really efficient way, i. e., by promoting the virtues of reverence, humility, and self-restraint. Loyalty to the Sovereign we can teach, and shall continue to do so however we may be treated in this matter: the sense of Citizenship is, however, different from the loyal submission of Subjects, while both are necessary for the well-being of a State; and that noble sense it is not ours to bestow, because it proceeds from equal laws alone. We have much to be grateful for. The Penal Code has been repealed; and Catholic Emancipation has given to us equal civil rights. Two-thirds of the work has thus been done; but religious Equality we have not, and, so far as the law goes, religious Freedom is denied to us, especially by that recent law which, if it could have been carried out, would have reduced a Church fourteen hundred years old to the condition of some recent Japanese mission, under its vicars apostolical. It is exclusively in self-defence that we allude to this subject. We admit an evil, and we suggest a remedy. In the civil sphere, the white banner of Queen Victoria floats over us; in the ecclesiastical, the black banner of the Tudors. We have to live at once in the nineteenth century, and in the sixteenth; and our sympathies are, for that reason, not in entire unity. Our

position is far better than it was ; but it is less consistent. We are bound to remember that our chain is loosed ; the statesman is bound not to forget that the half-broken chain clanks the loudest, and sometimes galls the most. Let us hope that Parliament will not adopt the modern quack system of seeking a cure in drugs calculated to aggravate the disease. Ardently do we wish that there existed in Ireland the same reverence for law that is boasted of in England : but by the Englishman the law has for centuries been regarded as the champion of his liberty, and the mother of his prosperity and peace ; and it is because the Irishman shares the same human nature as his English brother that he can fully entertain the same feelings only under similar circumstances. They alone are citizens of "no mean city" who have the freedom of that city :—till lately we lived in a ghetto within its bounds, and we are still excluded from its chief temples and its ancient courts. Not only religious duty, but religious expediency binds us over to loyalty. The English constitution is largely derived from the old Catholic times ; and its happy union of order with liberty is the exact soil in which Catholicity can best grow. In England itself, therefore, and in every English colony, it flourishes daily more and more. It must have done so long since but for those accidents of the past which associated it in the minds of Englishmen with absolute government, and with foreign allies—the two worst friends any religion can have. When the last nail was driven into the coffin of the last Stuart, its new career began ; and, considering that it has only had a clear stage since 1829, it has run well. A clear stage, if little favour it possesses ; and the fall of the British empire would be the greatest calamity not only which civilization, but especially which Catholicism could possibly sustain. England has a storehouse of loyalty and citizenship near her, whenever she has wit to use it. Woe to the nation without Loyalty ; in such a nation there is no foundation for morals or for religion ! Woe to the laws which will not allow an unrestricted reverence for law to make Loyalty perfect in its union with perfect Citizenship ! We are loyal by duty and by interest ; but let us be pardoned if we decline to repose, relatively to our religious and educational affairs, an absolute trust in a State which does not care to conceal its distrust of us.

We trust that in so serious a question as education the

State may not act such a part as can only end in adding one more to the differences which already embitter our social relations. Statesmen have sometimes an "orthodoxy" of their own. Let them not, on this occasion, carry it so far as to substitute the dead bulk of Educational Uniformity for a national unity of heart and will. We trust that those who laugh at claims to infallibility, will not set up an educational infallibility, and enforce it by pains and penalties. "*Sint ut sunt, aut non sint*," may be a resolution fit for a Religious Order which has rooted itself in the heart of Christendom, and the branches of which spread over all nations; for such an institute may have already arrived at the conviction that it is not its preservation but its restoration, that it has to provide for. It is otherwise with institutions by necessity ephemeral in their character, and the highest praise of which is that they do good in their day, without impeding any higher good. There are many school systems, and none of them can boast an exclusive and absolute superiority. Their value depends largely on circumstances of time and place, which vary perpetually. The world has lived through centuries in which hardly any, except an elementary and purely religious education, was either possible or desirable. It is no less true that circumstances may be imagined under which, all instruction connected with religion being imparted in churches sufficiently numerous, that given in schools might be exclusively secular. There are countries the education of which is conducted to a large extent without schools, and in which the instructors are vagrant, lodged now here and now there, and teaching from house to house. It is in the definitions of Faith, not in the "letters of Cadmus," that certainty and stability are to be looked for. We beseech the State not to make broad its phylacteries, or uplift its prophet rod in a minatory hand, upon an occasion wholly unworthy of such high energies. It doubtless has its theories: so have we; but we are by no means fanatics in their favour, unless it be fanaticism to avoid known dangers, denounce proved abuses, request that we may enjoy either a just and fair "Mixed System," such as was originally founded in Ireland, or else such a "Denominational" System as exists in England, the colonies, and almost every highly civilized part of the world. The present system we obviously

cannot approve until we withdraw our gratitude from the Statesmen who introduced that of 1831. "Great principles" are not numerous: volumes were written, and speeches without end were made in their honour, before England had gained her present educational advantages, or conquered the perils by which she too was assailed. We are not going to invoke many of them. We have indicated but a few; and it can hardly be thought unreasonable if we desire at least to keep as near to these as is practicable. One of them is Freedom of Education—that the State should no more force its own educational, than its own religious theories, on its people, whether by direct force, or by indirect coercion. The second is correlative to this. It is that the people, in order that it may duly value education, should contribute, individually, the necessary funds so far as circumstances permit, and also bestow on it that individual attention which binds class to class.* That the State,

* This principle is repeatedly insisted upon by a great authority on education, and one to whom Ireland has much cause for gratitude, Sir Thomas Wyse. He maintained in one of his most celebrated speeches, (a) that it was of the essence of sound Education that, in carrying it out, the state and the people, should take respectively their proper parts. Government is to found schools; but then "every parish shall have power to assess itself for the support of any such schools;" (p. 7,) and again, speaking of County Academies, he says, "Upon the Government should devolve the duty of founding and outfitting; and upon the people that of maintaining them; and their management should be conducted jointly by the Government and the people; the first through the National Board, the latter through a County Committee." (p. 16.) Where the people thus tax themselves locally for education, they are likely, not only to value it, but to have some voice in determining its character. Where the Government undertakes to provide all, it rules all; and the people are reduced to a state of helpless dependance, like that of the city in Asia Minor, of old, upon which a conqueror imposed a penalty thought at first an indulgent one, viz., that its inhabitants should assume the long robe of an effeminate race hard by. In the same speech Sir Thomas Wyse gives a complete scheme of National Education. Provincial Colleges were a *part* of it; but there was another part of which we never hear

(a) Speech of Thomas Wyse, Esq., M.P., on Academical, Collegiate and University Education in Ireland; at the meeting held for that purpose at Cork, November 13th, 1844.

which has a vested interest in the knowledge and virtue of every subject and citizen, should have a large control in all that relates to the secular part of education, seems to us also as obvious, especially where the State contributes to education, as that the religious part should be directed by the pastors of each denomination—even of that one which is diffused throughout the world, and which imparted its faith to the British empire—so long as they enjoy the confidence of that denomination.

But should the State take in this matter ever so unwise a course, it has neither the power of making us truckle to injustice, nor that of forcing upon us any rash or ill-advised course in opposition to it. Successive governments have been the chief cause of that opposition which is now complained of, by allowing the National System to drift so far away from its original principles, thus sacrificing its friends to propitiate its enemies; and by persisting, during ten years, in an endeavour to force upon our people a collegiate education, regarded by them, and by their spiritual guides, as essentially irreligious. Ever since the famine years, the course of legislation has been such as to discourage a trust like that which existed when the National System was introduced. Emancipation had then been recently carried; and every session added to the list of liberal measures passed for Ireland. Neither the Repeal agitation, nor the feelings with which Mr. O'Connell was regarded in England, made anything like

now. Either Trinity College, Dublin, was to be thrown open upon entirely equal terms, to Catholics and Protestants; or else "a Catholic University should be founded, with all the dignities, emoluments and privileges, at present enjoyed by the Protestant University of Dublin." (p. 27.) This was asking something more than a charter! We need not point out how different must be the working of a half system and of a whole system. For the Provincial Colleges Sir Thomas preferred the "mixed" principle, supposing residence not to be a part of the plan. He also states however, that if "every individual were required to live within the walls, and to form, as it were, one family, particular doctrine, discipline, and practices of piety must exist, impossible to maintain, unless all the *alumni* were of the same religious faith." (p. 30-1.) These words describe exactly the conditions on which Training schools exist, and consequently, as we have urged, the principles on which they ought to be conducted.

a reactionary policy seem probable. For a dozen years—since the death of O'Connell and of Peel—things have gone on differently. We have seen nearly a whole session passed in legislation against a Hierarchy: we have doubted whether our convents would be left to us: Maynooth has been in far greater danger than it was before Parliament had taken a course which was to have secured it for ever: statesmen have shewn us that, if a popular cry arises, we are not always to rely upon them for meeting it with the voice of wisdom and tranquil might. The time for resenting these things has passed; but a lesson has been left behind, and neither conscience nor prudence allow us to neglect it. We seek nothing which is not for the interests of the State, and of all religious persuasions in the land, as well as for our own. The State would not, we imagine, gain if the Catholic Education of Ireland, like Ireland's Church, were ultimately to rest in a predominant degree, on the Voluntary principle. If it should be equally resolved not to reform the present system, and not to concede a different one, our course, even in such a case, need by no means produce a change so sudden as to involve anything like convulsion, disunion, or even pecuniary demands beyond our means.

It is by gradual, but resolute, efforts that really important objects are gained, not by spasmodic movements: and the pressure by which Catholic truth works its way is strong at once and gentle, like that of a pacific sea leaning against a bank. Educational movements especially, are not the work of a day, and this is one reason for not postponing them too long. Without a season of struggle, perhaps neither that strength nor that knowledge would be won but for which the best educational opportunities could not be turned to a right account. If the present system be not reformed it is stone by stone that the dangerous parts of the fabric must be taken down, the main walls being underpropped while a more solid masonry is rising up beneath them. We shall have to carry on operations at once within the system, and externally to it. It depends mainly on ourselves to *what extent* we choose to make use of the National System,—as it seems to us we have thrown too much of our weight upon it, using it as a crutch rather than as a walking staff, and suffered accordingly. We have it in our power, without infringing any rule of the system, or forfeiting any of its advantages,

to withdraw our children first from model schools ; next from schools where religious instruction is given by a Protestant teacher only ; next from other schools where, owing to the character of the patron, or to the circumstances of the neighbourhood, the faith of the child is insecure. Such a mode of proceeding would not necessarily affect the great bulk of our schools in the three southern provinces. But we shall effect nothing of permanent good unless the work of Construction accompanies, nay, in some cases, precedes that of Destruction.

Among the educational efforts required by the exigencies of the present time there are three which strike us as being of pre-eminent importance ; and they have all of them this common characteristic, that their utility would be almost equally great whether the Mixed System continues to exist, or we have to achieve another. We want, in the first place, a Catholic Training School for our masters, and another for our mistresses, or rather we want several such. Not more than about half of our teachers are at present educated in the Training Schools in Marlborough street ; and we have seen how unsatisfactory is the education there given. In England there are excellent Training Schools for school mistresses at the Convent at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, and that of the ladies of " Notre Dame " at Liverpool ; the latter of which, especially, is so perfect that no one can inspect it without his ideas, as regards Catholic education, being enlarged and elevated. An admirable Training School for masters has been erected at Brook Green, Hammer-smith, with a garden of about two acres attached to it. Such institutions in Italy are, we believe, generally conducted by the great educational Order of St. Joseph Calasanctius, the introduction of which into this country could not but greatly increase the amount of that thoroughly religious education for which we are at present indebted, so far as boys are concerned, almost entirely to the Christian Brothers. The character of the master is more than half the battle in education : the question is not merely what he knows, nor what he can do, but what he is : the children soon come to understand him : he acts upon them, through their sympathies, with an influence almost magnetic. Schoolmasters cannot be made to order, nor cast in a mould ; neither is there any mechanical agency by which they are enabled to mould their

pupils in the mass. It is individually that they are to be formed, and that not without very special aptitudes: on their pupils they have to act individually, for each of the latter has a character of his own; and they have to work through an influence vital and moral, and through a tact which requires large sympathies, a single purpose, and an unusual forgetfulness of self. The teachers once what they ought to be, the character of our existing National Schools would change very beneficially; and we should thus find the instruments without which high educational efforts can but end in disappointment. Some of our schoolmistresses are already trained by nuns. Why should not all of them be thus trained?

The second effort to which we have referred as necessary is the publication of books more fit than those now used for the education of Catholic children. The more elementary volumes published by the National Board are excellent, and even the more advanced contain much that is good; but they are singularly uncatholic in tone. They are also far too materialistic rightly to form the hearts and consciences of the young; and this becomes of the more importance from the place which they retain in the small cottage library. The scientific portion of them seems to us quite out of proportion to the rest, and very much less calculated to elevate and refine the being, both intellectual and moral, than much that might be substituted for it.* The acts of the martyrs, the trials of early Christianity, the heroic legends that constitute the basis of history in almost every country, ballads which, without inflaming animosities, touch the spring of patriotic

* The following remarks by the Rev. Derwent Coleridge are the result of long experience. "The excellence of such a school will be determined, not, I venture to urge, by the geography, or natural history, not by the penmanship, nor even by the arithmetic, but in the first place, and above all, by the READING.....if oral teaching be the first gate of knowledge, reading is the second—a magnificent portal, opening into the whole domain. . . . The favour shewn to geography as compared with history, is essentially a preference of the mechanical to the spiritual; and thus forms part of that system, or way of thinking, which attaches itself to sensible experience, to the comparative neglect of moral Truth. Against every indication of this spirit it is the duty of the religious educationist to enter his protest."

emotion—these things are surely more ennobling and more fit for a peasant's education than scraps of chemistry or the minuter geography and natural history of regions he is little likely to see. There are doubtless portions of our history which ought to be passed by or very lightly touched, but this is no reason for excluding other and earlier portions of it. Danté, describing the high and happy condition of Florence, before the tide of corruption had set in, tells us how the Florentine matron used to sit among her maidens spinning, and recounting to them

“Old tales of Troy, and Fiesole, and Rome.”

We cannot help thinking that a people that has lost this instinct, by which the imagination withdraws us from the despotism of the senses, and the past supersedes a too engrossing present, remains in a very barbarous state, whatever progress it may have made in empirical knowledge.

We should be sorry to depreciate science ; but its elevating influence is chiefly for those who have made considerable progress in it. Of course no scientific truths can ever be antagonistic to religious truths ; but certain habits of mind are accidentally antagonistic to other habits of mind ; and the primary object of education is to develop the most elevating intellectual habits, while it disciplines the moral and religious being ; not merely to impart a certain quantum of information, or to arm people for the secular struggles of life. Nothing is more common than to meet in our present schools young persons who can answer questions in Geography or Arithmetic with surprising quickness, and who yet could not read aloud the most touching narrative in such a way as to evince intelligence or to kindle sympathy in others. We have sometimes heard it remarked that the intellectual advance witnessed in Ireland since the introduction of the National System has by no means been accompanied by a corresponding moral and spiritual improvement ; nay, that in some respects the heart of the people is less sound than it was of old, and its spirit both less patient and less soaring. Such a remark is a severe charge against the present system ; as would also be the assertion that the Irish are as dependent now, as they were thirty years ago, upon State aid in Education. Before the books of the National Board had attained a sort of practical monopoly, owing to their

low price, and to their merit in many respects, a Catholic Book Society had begun a work the suspension of which is a great misfortune. The National Schools, if they have superseded what was worthless in the old Hedge Schools, have also put an end to a vast deal of classical education, which was at one time more common among the poor people of Ireland than among those of almost any other country, and which not only exercised a vivifying influence on the popular imagination, but assisted many young men in preparing for ecclesiastical seminaries. Materialism is, it must be remembered, the fault of our age, and one that would especially destroy everything beautiful in the Irish character. Take away from it, what time has spared and calamity has preserved, generosity, devotedness, purity, imaginative aspiration, a lively fancy, a light heart, and a simplicity of nature which, as in the case of children, is not destroyed even when united with overmuch subtlety, and, no matter how unshaken their orthodoxy may remain, the religious virtues will share the wreck. For such a loss neither wealth nor knowledge could make amends. The peasant's cottage might be better roofed, but its good angel would have departed. Complaining as we do of the utilitarian character of the National System, and thinking that an education which leans to art is far more calculated to brighten the peasant's hearth, and sweeten social life, than one which leans to science, it would be unfair to pass by without a word of gratitude the attention which, in several of its Model Schools, as well as in the Central Training Schools, that System has bestowed upon music. This good example should be imitated in all Catholic schools. Such books as we have suggested would also be among our first requisites if we had separate schools; while they would be no less important as part of a reform in the existing system. Supposing the Board fairly constituted, there is no reason why it should not sanction additional volumes, more in harmony than the present with the genius of the Irish people. Even as regards the religious element in those books no difficulty exists. There seems no more reason why extracts from Dr. Newman's and Dr. Manning's works, from Milner or Lingard, should not be admitted, than for the exclusion of Porteus and Taylor, and Whateley, of Hume and of Robertson; and we believe that the exquisite minstrelsies of Southwell, Crashaw, and Habington, are quite as fit for Catholic children as the hymns of Watts. Under the mixed sys-

tem there must of course be a great reserve as to dogma; but if class-books are allowed, written in a very uncatholic spirit, but keeping clear from heterodox statements, there seems no reason why works written to the same extent in a Catholic spirit, and yet leaving Protestant opinions unassailed, should not be sanctioned also. The former class of works would probably continue to be used in Protestant National Schools—unless “High Church” principles should ever make way in Ireland. The latter would be used in schools frequented only by Catholics. In England there frequently exist, even in Protestant schools, books so Catholic that we could not complain of them.

Our third suggestion is the formation of a Catholic Educational Society. It should be composed of clergy and laity; one of its advantages being that it would accustom these two classes to co-operate, not in any small or local matter, but on a field of labour as large as Ireland. It is through such a Society that both the enterprises we have just referred to, and several others hardly less useful, could best be carried out. It, too, would assist us equally in making the best of the Mixed System, or in substituting a Separate System for the present one. For the latter course, indeed, it would be an almost indispensable pre-requisite; nor is it until the best energies of all our different classes, high and low, rich and poor, clerical and lay, have been trained to work together, that we can be adequately prepared to meet those practical difficulties which might, at first, oppose themselves to a System just in proportion as it was excellent in principle. Such a Society by its own organization would teach us Organization, the thing which we most stand in need of, and without which zeal lacks a sphere, and the most active exertions beat the air. In such a central Society schools under any unjust pressure would find at once the most experienced counsellor and the most efficient defender; nay, its very existence would probably in many cases prevent aggression; for it, too, would have its Inspection System, the vigilance of which could not easily be eluded. From it the districts which at present have no schools, or no safe schools, owing to extreme poverty, would find the supplementary aid they require. To it we should owe, ere long, Model Schools of a new sort, established successively, as fortresses of a Catholic education wherever the need for them was most urgent. Under its influence a school literature would spring up, uniting the

merits of those which belong to various countries; and Christian Art would be enabled to labour once more at her true vocation, the education of a people. Through it we should communicate both with England and the continent, thus escaping the chilling effects of isolation. Its Reports would extend our knowledge, increase our energies, and impart to the subject of education a dignity which would cause multitudes now apathetic to interest themselves in it. Its periodical meetings would concentrate our exertions, prevent the accumulation of abuses and keep us always on the advance. It should be supported by donations, bequests, annual subscriptions, and collections, the last of which would remind every peasant in the richer vales of Leinster and Munster that the outcast on the hills of Connaught, and the drudge in the manufacturing districts of Ulster, are his brothers; thus leading perhaps eventually to a Pastoral Aid Society, which would make the desert blossom and change to the most devout part of Ireland those districts which poverty and unjust laws have so long deprived almost of religious ministrations. Nearly all communities except our own possess such societies. In England what could have been done by the Established Church without the "National Society;"—and in this country how could Protestant education have made its cause good without the "Church Education Society?" Our fellow-countrymen and co-religionists in Great Britain, have shown us a good example; and to their "Poor School Committee" they owe chiefly the progress which Catholic education has made there of late years. That Society has served as their organ of communication with the State, has given them their training establishments, has largely aided the building of schools in all parts of England, has stimulated private efforts, put down proselytism, and raised the quality of education even more than it has increased it in quantity. Whenever we have such a Society in active operation we shall have been taught that best of all lessons—to help ourselves. No system of education which the most friendly of Governments could give us would work well if we threw ourselves upon its aid with the whole weight of helpless dependency. Till we have learned that our strength must be mainly from within, the system of education soundest and noblest in itself might be for us the most dangerous.

Such a Society as we have referred to would educate us into the right use of a sound educational system.

We cannot again be where we were before the late Pastoral. We must advance or recede. We have much cause for hope; but we should suffer equally from sloth, at such a period, and from any false move. The Parliamentary part of the struggle will be of little avail if we do nothing outside the walls of Parliament. Within those walls we earnestly hope that all the Catholic members will see the necessity of avoiding idle recriminations respecting points as to which they may differ. The end must be the same in all cases—a really sound system of Catholic Education. Towards this great common end all their efforts must be made to contribute, whether they seek it by the same means, or by two different, but not opposed, modes of operation. Within the last two or three days Mr. Cardwell's answer to the memorial of the Bishops has been published. It refuses to concede a separate system of Education: on the other hand, if there be meaning in words, it recognises the necessity of very important reforms in the present system. It distinctly and repeatedly refers to Mr. Stanley's Letter as the authoritative standard of the National System. It states that the principles of that letter *secure to the clergy their legitimate right of conveying religious instruction to the members of their respective churches.* It says, "I declare to you with equal plainness their (the Government's) desire to give full effect to that other principle of the system which provides for *separate religious teaching*, and respects, in the case of every child, the just authority of the parent." It engages to remove any just cause of complaint, as tested by *these principles*, and by the *Document* referred to as the exponent of the system. Our recapitulation of the changes which that system has undergone suffices to prove that such an engagement, if kept, involves both large and searching reforms.

We are sometimes asked to point out in detail the reforms needed by the present system in order to assimilate it, at least in spirit to that which was announced by Mr. Stanley's letter. The following list may be considered as an approximate answer to that question, provided it be understood that we neither assert the absolute necessity of every suggestion contained in it, nor deny the impor-

tance of other suggestions not included in it. It is hardly necessary to add that in this, as in all else, that regards a subject so momentous, we speak altogether in the way of suggestion, and with entire and unreserved submission to those to whom alone it is competent to decide with authority.

1. In the case of Vested Schools return to the two original principles both as to pastoral authority, and as to a "separate religious," as well as a "combined literary" education. Discard in these schools all books that do not respect this principle.

2. In the Non-vested Schools, if the State respects that later engagement unfortunately made, by which the Catholic Clergy may be excluded by Protestant Patrons, then, on the other hand, let Catholics be enabled to have efficient Non-vested Schools in the same localities by means of a law enabling Sites to be taken for Schools as they are for Coast-guard Stations ;—those Sites to revert to the original Proprietors, if they cease to be used for the purposes of National Education.

3. In no school let the child receive religious instruction from a person whose Faith is different from that of the child's Parent, without that Parent's written consent.

4. The system of literary Model Schools should be gradually abandoned ; and those that at present exist should be fairly distributed between the Catholic and Protestant bodies.

5. Non-vested Training Colleges should be established, either in place of, or in addition to, the present Central Training Schools ; so that masters and mistresses in training shall have the advantage of a proper discipline, and shall receive their higher instruction from persons of their own Faith.

6. Additional books, compiled by Catholics, but not touching upon controverted points, should be sanctioned, when preferred, for the use of Schools under Catholic Patrons.

7. Patronage to be fairly administered. A Catholic Resident Commissioner :—an equal number of Catholics and Protestants at the Board ; and a similar principle to be carried out in the Department of Inspection.

8. The Sign of the Cross to be permitted by the Board in all schools.

9. Either the Presbyterian Worship to be excluded, or else the Mass to be permitted in Non-vested Schools, and also the symbols of Catholic devotion. The Anglican worship to be similarly permitted on the same conditions.

10. Monastic Schools to receive grants on terms as favourable as those accorded to other Non-vested Schools.

11. Building Grants to be again given to schools though not vested in the Board.

So far as Protestant Non-vested Schools are concerned, if any further concessions can be made, calculated to improve the character of Protestant Education, without assailing the Faith of Catholic

children, we should rejoice to see them. It is with the proselytising zeal only, not with the religious interests of our Protestant fellow-countrymen, that we are at war. Under no Educational System can there be peace in Ireland until it is clearly understood that a System of Education supported by public funds must be, as regards religious contests, absolutely neutral ground. Polemical strife is an evil from which the training of the young ought to be kept sacred.

Since writing the above passages we have heard that the Church Education Society, with its 2500 Schools, has determined to join the National Board. There is an end then, if this be true, of the curious assumption that Catholics were to have the National System all to themselves in the South, and Protestants in the North. The system henceforth must stand on its merits; and its working must be determined by its Principles and its Rules, not by accidental circumstances. There are however, certain permanent and well known circumstances which must, unless corrected, make the same Rules assume a wholly different character, as regards different religious denominations. Those who so frequently remind us that the English system would work differently in England and in Ireland have penetration enough to see that the *non-vested* part of the National system, in which the religious instruction is at the disposal of the patron, must also work in the most opposite manner for those who possess wealth and lands, and for those who cannot even command a site for a school. If no legislative means be adopted to secure sites for Catholic as well as for Protestant Non-vested schools, the choice of the Catholic child in the latter will be that of either receiving Protestant religious instruction, or contenting himself with a merely secular education. The present system, it is true, does not take away the liberty of the subject; and out of school the child may go where he pleases: but few statesmen would affirm that the poorer part of our population can be expected to provide separate buildings and teachers in order to receive, out of school, that sacred portion of their education which is denied to them within it. We shall soon see with what degree of equal justice the State is prepared to hold up the balance of Education between those who frankly accepted the National system from the first, in spite of misgivings which they never concealed; who, with a credulous trust, allowed concession after concession to be made, of a character consistently unfavourable to them; who continued to support that system for a quarter of a century, though almost every one of their remonstrances, produced by its more dangerous alterations, was successively treated with disdain; whose patience seemed inexhaustible so long as any hope remained of the system being maintained upon the principles upon which it was introduced:—between this class of her majesty's subjects, and another which greeted the National system with every form of contumely; which continued for years, on the one hand to vilify it, on the other to

distort it by the changes their acute perseverance forced upon it ; and which joined it at last, in spite of a thousand conscientious protests, only when the completeness of those changes, and the permanent character attached to them by time, had fitted that system apparently to become the instrument of their will.

ART. IV.—*Ceylon : an Account of the Island—Physical, Historical, and Topographical* ; with Notices of its Natural History, Antiquities, and Productions. By Sir James Emerson Tennent, K.C.S., LL.D., &c. London : Longmans, 1859.

IT was once said, and with some show of reason, that every island in the world was claimed by Spain. England has done something better than claim the islands ; she has taken nearly every one of them, or such, at least, of them as were at all worth having. If there be any old ally, or old enemy of ours, Catholic, Protestant, Pagan, or Musulman, that has not lost an island to us at one time or another, it is only because the fortunate state had not an island to lose. Spain, France, Holland, and Denmark, have been made to contribute alike to the extension of the British colonies ; and neither Catholic countries nor the natural enemies of England have had most reason to complain. Holland has been the greatest sufferer by far ; Holland, to whom Protestantism stands more deeply indebted than to any country in Europe, with perhaps the exception of Sweden ; and to whom English Protestantism is the most heavily in debt of all. Holland was to Protestantism in general not merely what the England of to-day is to political refugees, a shelter from pursuit ; she was a working and an active ally. Not only did she protect, comfort, and cherish the Protestant refugees from every part of Europe, but she took into her own hands the threads of their intrigues, and knotting them on to hers, she borrowed and repaid their strength. But she did infinitely more for England. It was in her bosom that the English revolution was contrived ; it was she who furnished to the revolution a king, an army, and a fleet. For this she was

requited in the way we all know ; and New York, New-Holland, the Cape, and Ceylon, are substantial evidences of British gratitude.

And it is not a little remarkable that England should be the only country at whose hands Holland has suffered any real, that is to say, any permanent loss. A comparatively good understanding was established between Spain and the revolted provinces, as soon as the latter had secured their independence ; nor do we find any very active hostilities between the two countries after the reign of Philip II. Louis XIV. defeated the Dutch in those famous campaigns, celebrated by Corneille in verses almost as wearisome as those of Addison upon the victories of Marlborough, and done into Latin of as drowsy an influence by the Père De la Rue. But Louis XIV. never crippled the strength or lowered the prestige of the United Provinces. Portugal was not a match for Holland, and never gained in her conflicts with that power ; but England, her natural ally, her adopted, and (shall it be said ?) her spoiled child, was the only state in Europe that plundered her, stripped her, and deposed her from her rank.

It is impossible to feel any degree of sympathy for Holland, and it is difficult to suppose that the instrument of her humiliation was not chosen with design. Dutch Protestantism is, or was, the most repulsive variety of the species. It is perhaps less gloomy, morose, and savage than that of Scotland ; and though equally cruel abroad, it never was quite so insolent and fanatical at home. Neither was it so insularly stiff, nor so dismal, at least upon Sundays, as the other ; but in its early period it was colder, craftier, and every way uglier than anything we read of elsewhere. But above all it was mean. Speaking generally, meanness is not the vice of Protestantism. A religion begotten in pride, and always asserting independence, although destined never to enjoy it, ought still to be free from the vice of meanness. And so it is with Protestantism generally. A Protestant who in practice as in theory sets faith above works, and sins that grace may abound, is of course the most independent man alive ; but even he whose thoughts do not range the breadth of one idea beyond the nasal teaching of his minister, believes that he is free and independent, and certainly does gain in spirit and bearing by his belief. The Anglican who is fettered by articles, and homilies, and formularies, and

canons, and church discipline acts, and decisions of the Court of Arches, and more than all, by traditions under which he chafes but from which he cannot escape; he too, believes that he is independent, and he is therefore straight and proud. The Presbyterian who swears by the Westminster Catechism, and excommunicates any brother who presumes to think differently, is perfectly unconscious of subjection, and believes that he is free, with a faith as undoubting as that of the hypochondriac who believes he is a tea-pot. In a worldly sense, this Protestant delusion is at least a generous one, and will not engender meanness. The Huguenots were gallant soldiers and gentlemen of honour. The parliamentary saints of England carried their round heads upon stiff necks; and the Swedes of Gustavus and Charles were a splendid military race; but the Dutch, although they certainly did not lose the fighting qualities that won their independence, seem to have acquired, or to have had developed along with their Protestantism, a meanness quite unknown to independent nations. Where they forbore to persecute, their forbearance was gainful; when they did persecute, toleration would have been unprofitable. In the courts of the heathen their spirit was that of a bag-man soliciting orders, and they oppressed their Catholic countrymen at home with no greater fanaticism than that of a bill discounter. "What was not provided for by the constitutions of their government," says Sir William Temple, "was so in a very great degree by the connivance of their officers, who *upon certain constant payments from every family*, suffer the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion in their several jurisdictions, as free and easie, though not *so cheap* and so avowed as the rest."*

Hence there are few Protestant writers above the level of Mr. Tresham Gregg or Dr. Cumming, who are not forward to condemn the part taken by the Dutch against the Japanese Christians, and the profanation of the cross which, until within the last few years, they willingly committed as the price of their permission to trade with Japan. Even those Protestants who have no particular respect for the cross, and have perhaps rather an aversion to it, would hesitate to set their feet upon the symbol of redemption,

* Temple's Works, vol. i. p. 58.

well knowing that in the eyes of the Japanese, as of the world generally, the cross is the symbol of Christianity, and that those who trample upon the one are understood to abjure the other. And doubtless there are many whom even this consideration would not deter from so odious an offence, and who would yet be revolted by its meanness. But the Dutch were never known to be affected by scruples, whether of religion or of honour. Religion they conceived was a good thing in its kind and place. The church was the place for religion, as the bed for sleep, or the dining-room for eating. But they never would permit it to interfere in the ordinary concerns of life. Their business in this world was to buy and sell, and if it might be, to outwit and to cheat.

“Mammon led them on,
Mammon, the least erected spirit that fell
From heav’n, for e’en in heav’n his looks and thoughts
Were always downward bent, admiring more
The riches of heav’n’s pavement-trodden gold
Than ought divine or holy else enjoyed
In vision beatific.”

The island which is the subject of Sir Emerson Ten-
nent’s book, was perhaps the most valuable possession of
the Dutch republic, although not turned to the greatest
account. Its natural wealth would seem to be almost
unlimited, so far as it has been yet discovered, and
we may well suppose that a country which includes a
mountain range of the mean height of the Pyrenees, can-
not but conceal mineral treasures which will yet be the
reward of enterprise. The island, with an area not larger
than that of Ireland, includes almost every variety of sur-
face and of soil, with, however, but few varieties of climate.
Some of its natural productions once amongst the princi-
pal sources of wealth, must disappear before long in the
ordinary course of civilization. As soon as the forests,
the “*stabula alta ferarum*,” shall have been cleared,
there will be as complete an end of the renowned elephants
of Ceylon, as is sometimes made of the peasantry in
another island, by an improving landlord under her
Majesty’s writ of “*Habere facias possessionem*.” For
many years past the elephant, as an article of commerce,
whether for its ivory or for its service, has ceased to main-
tain its earlier value. The colonial government, indeed,



has largely availed itself of the strength and sagacity of the elephant, in the prosecution of great public works, and especially in the formation of roads, which are the elements of modern civilization. The elephant, according to Sir Emerson Tennent's account, would seem to be as kindly treated, and as well cared for, as any other servant of man; but, like other servants, his work is often too much for him, and whether as a result of the fatigues undergone in the course of his capture, or whether it be from some constitutional peculiarity, or, again, from a broken heart, as the natives say, the elephant does often die suddenly in the first month, or even the first week of his service. The government stud, therefore, requires to be recruited from the jungle by captures upon the large scale described by Sir Emerson, while in addition to this, private hunters pursue the elephants for the sake of game, and they are murdered by civilized Englishmen in the name of sport. It is by their effective services upon the roads, however, that they most contribute to the destruction of their race; for, every mile of road encroaches on their pastures, and pushes them out into the fatal air of civilization. It is almost the case of Charles I., upon whom parliament levied war in his own name. But at all events the elephants are near their end, and if they last until the roads are all made, government will be thankful, and make no complaints. But, meanwhile, other sources of riches are being rapidly developed. The cocoa nut, the cinnamon tree, and the lately introduced coffee plant, with an endless variety of native tropical fruits and spices, are daily becoming more valuable. The reconstruction of the ancient tanks, and the use of an improved system of irrigation, will make the rice grounds what they were in the early days of Singhalese prosperity, and the whole will suffice not only for the purposes of distant commerce, but for the support of a great population at home.

The ruins of cities and temples, but above all, the dilapidated tanks or artificial basins, would argue a very high degree of civilization in ancient Ceylon, if we were left to inference. Indeed, an argument of civilization, founded upon the existence of monuments such as we find in Ceylon, could hardly be called inference in the ordinary sense of the word, for it amounts to evidence. But concurrently with those monuments, we have a more or

less authentic history of Ceylon, covering a space of more than two thousand years, which, even without the monuments, would prove the existence of an extinct civilization. And when the Singhalese history is alluded to as more or less authentic, the term must be considered as applying to some only of the facts which seem to border on the fabulous, or are liable to the same misrepresentations as occur in any European history. The work itself is undoubtedly genuine, although so long neglected by the learned in Europe. Like Greek or Roman history, it contains an admixture of mere fable, but it seems to be as faithworthy a book as you find in the run of histories, and it sometimes gives catalogues of facts and names too dry not to be perfectly true.

Coupling all that is told us in the history with the evidence of the monuments, and especially of the tanks, which are quite as wonderful in their way as the Roman aqueducts, it cannot be doubted that the island must have supported some ten or twelve millions of inhabitants. Were we to understand the native annals literally, the number was much greater. But making every possible allowance for exaggeration, a thing so common in dealing with numbers, and particularly with round numbers, the population must have been great, and if considered with reference to the available area of the island, extraordinary. If we deduct from the entire area, the mountain ranges, which were either inaccessible or unprofitable, and the vast tracts of forest that supplied pasture to the elephants, and the great area that was enclosed in the tanks and artificial or natural watercourses, and also the quantity of land that required to be submerged for the cultivation of rice; the ten or twelve millions who may, without exaggeration, be supposed to have inhabited the remainder of the island, must have been closely packed. The civilization that existed at the time was, it hardly requires to be said, something very different from modern, and still more from Christian civilization, for unfortunately there is too often a distinction between the two. In the mechanical and decorative arts, however, which many seem to identify with civilization, the Singhalese do not seem to have been more backward than any nation of the east. Their architecture, it is true, did not conform to our standard of taste, which is usually borrowed from the Greek models; and their ornamentation was of that profuse and

elaborate kind which has been called barbaric ; but if high civilization involve what is somewhat arbitrarily deemed correct taste, England must be the least civilized country in Europe.

Sir Emerson Tennent leaves little unsaid about Ceylon that can be crowded, without confusion, into the limits of a readable book ; and the book, it must be said, is very readable. The two volumes of the work include what is a good deal more than a summary of the political history of Ceylon, up to the appearance of the Portuguese ; and thenceforth a detailed history of the country during the Portuguese and Dutch settlements, and of the annexation of the island to the British empire. The physical and topographical description of Ceylon is as interesting as the historical account, and perhaps even more complete. In fact the difficulty would be to say what it has left out. The hybernation of bears, and the æstivation of fishes ; the polity of the white ants in their limited monarchy, and an inquiry into the habits of the elephant, with a special view to the vindication of his character ; the transformations of the coffee-bug, the analysis of the serpent stone, and the anatomy of the land leech ; the sacred Bo-tree of Anaragapoorah, and the theory of Betel chewing ; the parasite of the bat, and the Maha-pus-wail, or great hollow climber ; everything, in fact, belonging to Ceylon in the animal and vegetable reign, may be found in Sir Emerson's wonderful volumes. That the account is interesting every one can witness ; that it is clear, well arranged, and not wanting in descriptive power, is equally true ; and that the author relies upon numerous authorities, and holds them responsible, may be seen by a glance at the foot of the page ; but whether on the whole this portion of the work is accurate and faithworthy, whether Sir Emerson's volumes will serve as books of reference, and whether, as one of his critics has said, " They will be valued by all serious students in proportion to the study and the trouble they save ; " are questions which it will take time to determine. It is certain that some of his statements are questioned, and some positively denied. At all events he is probably not more inaccurate as a natural historian, than was Goldsmith ; and who will say that he is not as amusing ?

These remarks, if they apply at all, will apply only to what Sir Emerson has stated upon the authority of others ;

and, whether his accounts be quite according to the fact or otherwise, the book is a surprising performance ; for the author has written with great clearness, order, and descriptive power, upon scientific matters, embarrassed by hard and obscure terms of art, with which, from his general pursuits, we cannot suppose him to have had more than a very superficial acquaintance at the utmost. Less, than a lifetime of study would hardly qualify any man but a Humboldt to write upon even one of the subjects of natural history which Sir Emerson Tennent has included in his work : but where anything has fallen under his own observation, we are quite willing to admit his facts, with every prudent reserve as to the references.

The most valuable portion of the work, in every respect, is that which deals with the political history of Ceylon ; and, over and above the information which Sir Emerson Tennent has extracted for us from the native annals, he has been enabled, by his own observation, to confirm, in numerous interesting particulars, the accounts of Ceylon, which we derive from the earliest as well as from the more modern Greek and Latin writers, who have touched upon the subject. With the exception of one who had been detained in captivity by the Singhalese King for years, but without any circumstances of cruelty or ill treatment, and exactly as Knox had been detained many centuries later, none of those writers had, like Sir Emerson, the advantage of personal observation. That of the captives was naturally very limited, but such as it was, we have been allowed the benefit of it. The other writers who mentioned Ceylon, had their accounts of it second hand, and their writings are consequently full of fable and exaggeration. They have assigned to it, three times, and four times its actual extent, and have embellished their descriptions with numerous fictions, upon which they may or may not have themselves improved. Herodotus most probably had his accounts of the wonderful Persian ants, "smaller than dogs but larger than foxes," from honest Greek tars, who could spin a yarn as well as any British tar alive. The Cynocephali and the Sciapodes of Aristophanes, belonged, we may suppose, to the same family ; but no one doubts that there is a great deal of substantial history in the books of Herodotus. Ceylon first became known to the Greeks, as far as we can ascertain, about the time of Alexander, and is first noticed by Strabo, under the

name of Taprobane, a name which it retained long after the embassy of the Singhalese to the Emperor Claudius, and about the etymology of which—

Grammatici certant et adhuc sub judice lis est.

In the Chinese Annals, however, much earlier mention is made of it, and Sir Emerson Tennent seems to have convinced himself that the Harbour of Point de Galle is the Tarshish of Scripture. His arguments are plausible to say the least, and we, for our own part, can see no reason why it should not be; but although we have no proof of much that has been written by the ancients regarding Ceylon, a great deal also derives confirmation from the Singhalese books, and from the experience of Europeans since the date of the Portuguese settlement. Amongst the most remarkable of Singhalese habits noticed by the ancients, and still preserved, is the habit of drawing the bow with the foot, observable amongst the Veddahs; and the practice, still in full vigour with the men generally, of wearing long hair, which they confine with combs and hair pins, exactly after the fashion of women. Their jealousy of foreign intrusion also, is noticed as well by the Chinese, as by the Greeks, although in the end, it availed the inhabitants of Ceylon as little as it is likely to avail the Chinese or Japanese. But, the closeness of those nations might be called hospitality and unguardedness, in comparison with the reserve of the Singhalese; a reserve which is still maintained by some of the aboriginal tribes. Unlike the Chinese, they held no intercourse, however cautious or guarded, with a stranger. They never suffered themselves to be seen, but exposed their wares for sale, with some conventional mark of a price affixed, as Chinese writers have stated, and as the Singhalese ambassadors themselves informed the Emperor Claudius. If the wares pleased the stranger, he took them with him and deposited the price; a practice which is observed at the present day in every particular by some of the tribes of the interior, in their dealings with the other races.

To this mysterious secrecy, and to the practice of detaining in captivity, the luckless stranger who, for any purpose whatever, should have roamed somewhat inland, may be ascribed the fables which prevailed amongst the Chinese, relative to the inhabitants of Ceylon, and which

have a strong family resemblance to the classic stories of the Sirens, the Lotophagi, and Lestrigonians. The stories of the Chinese describe Ceylon as inhabited by she-devils of exceeding beauty, whose practice it was to decoy the merchants who travelled those seas, and then to eat them up without mercy. Sir Emerson Tennent copies the account from a French translation of Hionen Thsang, a Chinese Buddhist of the seventh century. "Elles épiaient constamment les marchands qui abordaient dans l'isle, et se changeant en femmes d'une grande beauté, elles venaient au-devant d'eux avec des fleurs odorantes, et au son des instruments de musique, leur adressaient des paroles bienveillantes et les attiraient dans la ville de fer. Alors elles leur offraient un joyeux festin, et se livraient au plaisir avec eux : puis elles les enfermaient dans un prison de fer, et les mangeaient l'un après l'autre." But a coincidence more singular still is to find the story of Circe and Ulysses, reproduced in the "Mahawanso" or legendary history of the Bengalee dynasty of Ceylon. In this story, the founder of the dynasty, Prince Wijayo plays the part of Ulysses ; and a native princess, not a goddess, however, but a magician, like Armida, is the Singhalese Circe. Sir Emerson Tennent finds it difficult to imagine that the Singhalese chronicler had not some knowledge of Homer ; and our principal reason for supposing that he had not, is the poor account to which, in that case, he would have turned his knowledge in the construction of the fable. There is no doubt a striking similarity approaching to identity between the two stories ; but the most beautiful incidents in the story of Ulysses, are left out in the adventure of Wijayo. We cannot suppose the writer of the Mahawanso to have been deterred by conscientious scruples or by fear of detection, from appropriating the whole of the adventure, if he did in fact appropriate so very large a portion of it. And indeed Sir Emerson Tennent qualifies his theory of the Homeric scholarship of the Mahawanso, by saying, that, remnants only of the original story had reached the compiler after having been passed from hand to hand by successive story tellers. The resemblance, however, between the Homeric and the Singhalese legend, is so curious that the passage is worth extracting ; and perhaps it is not least so on account of the dissimilarity. Ulysses is never more thoroughly the gentleman, the orator, the diplomatist, and the king, than in his encounter with Circe. If he does resort to the rather

ungallant proceeding of drawing his sword upon a lady, it is merely as part of a spell and in compliance with superior orders: he means no harm, and it is the exception to his uniform course. Both before and afterwards, he is perfectly deferential to the goddess; and in his plea on behalf of his unfortunate companions, he is the same gently persuasive orator we have always known; while his delight upon recovering his companions, is enough to move even the stern Circe. Wijayo is a hero of quite a different stamp. He draws his sword like a militiaman in a tap; and when he catches the lady by the hair he means real mischief.

"Wijayo and his followers, having made good their landing, are met by a *devo* (a divine spirit,) who blesses them, and ties a sacred thread as a charm on the arm of each. One of the band presently discovers the Princess in the person of a devotee, seated near a tank, and she being a magician (Yakkini) imprisons him, and eventually the rest of his companions, in a cave. The *Mahawanso* then proceeds: 'All these persons not returning, Wijayo, becoming alarmed, equipping himself with the five weapons of war, proceeded after them, and examined the delightful pond. He could perceive no footsteps but those leading down into it, and there he saw the Princess. It occurred to him his retinue must surely have been seized by her, and he exclaimed, 'Pray, why dost not thou produce my attendants?' 'Prince,' she replied, 'from attendants what pleasure canst thou derive? Drink and bathe ere thou departest.' Seizing her by the hair with his left hand, whilst with his right he raised his sword, he exclaimed, 'Slave, deliver my followers or die.' The Yakkini, terrified, implored for her life. 'Spare me, Prince, and on thee will I bestow sovereignty, my love, and my service.' In order that he might not be again involved in difficulty he forced her to swear, and when he again demanded the liberation of his attendants she brought them forth, and declaring 'these men must be famishing,' she distributed to them rice, and other articles procured from the wrecked ships of mariners who had fallen a prey to her. A feast follows, and Wijayo and the Princess retire to pass the night in an apartment which she causes to spring up at the foot of a tree, curtained as with a wall and fragrant with incense."

Long before the arrival of the Portuguese, Ceylon had been falling into that state which is the sure forerunner of national extinction, when it follows upon a long course of prosperity, and by which, foreign conquerors are attracted as certainly as the vulture to the carcass. Every province has now its own king, and all the kings are at war with

each other. Foreign mercenaries summoned to the aid of this king, or of that, find it profitable to make war upon their own account, and then to be bought off. According as the central power grows weaker, the petty kings are driven to share their authority with influential feudatories, who fight for their immediate lord when it suits their convenience, and fight against him on the same principle, just as the great barons had been used to do in Europe. All the while, cities are sacked and desolated, fields are ravaged, farm-steads and villages with their inhabitants disappear, rice grounds fall back into swamp and jungle, the tanks are wantonly broken or become dilapidated by neglect; and everything betokened the rapid decay and proximate subjection of Ceylon, when the first Portuguese ship makes its appearance in the offing.

The Portuguese settlement began according to the usual precedent in such cases. The Portuguese first obtained liberty to establish a factory for the innocent purposes of trade. It then became necessary to place the factory in a state of defence, against marauders merely, but by no means against the sovereign authorities of the country, by whose permission the factory stood there. The factory soon expanded into a fort, mounting heavy guns, of which the Singhalese had hitherto known nothing. By and by the kings of Cotta, who had the nominal sovereignty of the island, came to think that the Portuguese might be turned to account in disturbing the balance of power. In due course the Portuguese were taken into the service of the king. Their fort grew into a town; they fought his battles for him, and as a natural result provoked his jealousy. Meanwhile the Singhalese had learned the use of firearms, and the Portuguese had now to fight against the king as well as for him. The wars between the Portuguese and the Islanders were stained by cruelties unknown to civilised warfare, as might have been expected, and as always happens where one of the belligerents is unacquainted with the laws that in some degree mitigate the inevitable horrors of war. Treachery upon the one side is followed by retaliation upon the other, and so begins the series of reprisals, which go on perpetually increasing their atrocity. At length a king of Cotta bequeathed his kingdom to the crown of Portugal, whose claims thenceforward assumed a colour of legitimacy; but during the entire period of the Portuguese occupation, the

intervals of peace were extremely few ; and although Portuguese discipline generally prevailed, it very often met with reverses. It must be said, too, that treacherous massacres of the Portuguese by the natives are features of very frequent recurrence throughout the history of those wars, whereas we rarely find the former defeated in fair battle ; and it also appears that their cruelties, however odious and indefensible, were usually perpetrated in heat of blood, and during the fight or immediately afterwards.

Side by side with this struggle for dominion, another movement was going on, of which alone, the Portuguese have no reason to be ashamed. They openly professed that the exaltation of the faith was the main, if not the sole, object of their conquests, and we cannot doubt that it was one of their paramount objects. Their policy in other particulars was too often of a kind to defeat their hopes and labours in this respect ; but that the exaltation and spread of the faith was a great and uniform feature of their general policy is quite certain. During the brief intervals of peace which occurred throughout the occupation, they promoted this object with all their might. Nothing that missionary labour could effect for the conversion of the natives, was left undone ; and whenever the Portuguese formed an alliance with any of the Singhalese princes, they always stipulated for liberty to preach Christianity. The Singhalese were amongst the earliest disciples of St. Francis Xavier's companions ; and although the Rajah of Jaffnapatam afterwards murdered six hundred of their converts, he by no means succeeded in exterminating Christianity. The king of Candy at one time invited the missionaries and at another he expelled them ; a son of one of the kings of Cotta was baptised in Lisbon, and from time to time a king of Cotta and various members of the royal family became Christians. One of the most powerful and able of these princes apostatized, and the action of the missionaries was in this way extensively thwarted, interrupted, and again resumed ; but when the Portuguese dominion was brought to a close by the issue of the war with the Dutch, the conquests which they had won for religion survived the loss of their territory, and as Sir Emerson Tennent bears witness, the religion which they planted is still propagating its boundaries and enlarging its influence.

Sir Emerson Tennent, more it appears to us from a

fashion of speaking, than from a habit of thought, in many places treats the religious policy of the Portuguese as fanaticism; but whenever he come to reason deliberately and to state facts, he curiously disproves his own assertions. We had occasion to advert to this circumstance some years ago in our notice of his book upon Christianity in Ceylon, which it seems had been intended by the author to form part of the present work. It is not unlikely that Sir Emerson Tennent has worked off even since then some of the prejudices which still seem to cling to him. We know that his expanding liberality has earned for him something very like a strong dislike from his old friends in Belfast, who, notwithstanding their superior Christianity, are rather good haters. He ventured, we believe, on one occasion, to hint to them that no one can make a clear escape from the atmosphere of Belfast without leaving most of his Belfast prejudices behind, and we hardly think he will improve in the esteem of revived Christianity after having lived in a place so far beyond the range of its influences as the island of Ceylon. Sir Emerson Tennent is certainly not to be claimed as an admirer of Catholicity in any of its aspects, but it is something to find a man who will not twist a plain fact, because perhaps he might like it to be otherwise, and who will give you the benefit of his experience, to make what use of it you may think best, although it may convey to him a very different lesson from that which it conveys to you, and from that which he might wish it to convey.

The Dutch, after an occupation of almost equal length with that of the Portuguese, have left behind them no traditions but those of contempt. Their descendants retain little of the original Dutch settlers but their names. The language and religion of Holland have all but completely disappeared from the island. Their first league, which resulted in the expulsion of the Portuguese, was with one of the most haughty, suspicious, and treacherous of the native tyrants, Rajah Singha II. The Portuguese never forfeited the respect of the natives by one act of meanness, during the entire period of their rule. Their conceptions were grand, the execution of them daring. They were an army of gentlemen and heroes. If they had the ambition and the cruelty of kings, they had whatever of nobleness belongs to kings, or is ascribed to them. Although they lusted for dominion, they were ready to sacrifice every-

thing for religion ; and the magnificence of Constantine Braganza, who refused countless treasures rather than surrender the sacred tooth to the idolatry of Pegu, contrasted favourably with the meanness of the Dutch, who would themselves have worshipped the sacred tooth for a valuable consideration.

" The Viceroy called on the treasurer to produce the tooth. He handed it to the archbishop, who in their presence placed it in a mortar, and with his own hand reducing it to powder, cast the pieces into a brazier, which stood ready for the purpose ; after which, the ashes and the charcoal together were cast into the river in sight of all, they crowding to the verandahs and windows which looked upon the water.

" Many protested against this measure of the Viceroy, since there was nothing to prevent the Buddhists from making other idols ; and out of a piece of bone they could shape another tooth in resemblance of the one they had lost, and extend to it the same worship ; whilst the gold that had been rejected would have repaired the pressing necessities of the State. In Portugal itself much astonishment was expressed that these proceedings should have been assented to.

" To commemorate the event, and to illustrate the spirit which had dictated an act approved by the Fathers of the Company, and signalized by zeal for Christianity and the glory of God, a device was designed as follows : On an escutcheon was a representation of the Viceroy and the Archbishop surrounded by the prelates, monks, and divines who had been present on the occasion, and in the midst was the burning brazier, together with Buddhists offering purses of money. Above, the letter C, being the initial of Don Constantine, was repeated five times, thus—

C. C. C. C. C.

And below it the five words,

Constantinus cœli cupidine crumenas cremavit.

The interpretation being that 'Constantine, devoted to heaven, rejected the treasures of earth.' "

Exasperated as were the Singhalese at the rapacity, cruelty, and ambition of the Portuguese settlers, they did not fail to recognize and admire whatever was great and noble in the Portuguese character. The language as well as the religion of Portugal had made rapid progress amongst them before the arrival of the Dutch, and the proudest chiefs were ambitious of the title of Don, with a Portuguese Christian name, which many of them continued to bear even after their relapse into Buddhism. The

ascendancy of the Portuguese language is not yet destroyed, and that of the religion is still on the increase. This, if anything, ought to be a decisive test of the comparative merit of the Portuguese and Dutch policy. Sir Emerson Tennent has made the comparison in two or three places.

“The fanatical zeal of the Roman Catholic Sovereigns for the propagation of the faith, was replaced by the earnest toil of Dutch traders to entrench their trading monopolies; and the almost chivalrous energy with which the soldiers of Portugal resented or resisted the attacks of the native princes, was exchanged for the subdued humbleness with which the merchants of Holland endured the insults and outrages perpetrated by the tyrants of Kandy upon their envoys and officers. The maintenance of peace was so essential to the extension of commerce, that no provocation, however gross, was sufficient to rouse them to retaliation, provided the offence was individual or local, and did not interrupt the routine of business at their factories on the coast.

“The unworthiness of such a policy was perceptible even to the instincts of the barbarians, with whom they had to deal, and Raja Singha II., by the arrogance and contempt of his demeanour and intercourse, attested the scorn with which he endured the presence of the faithless intruders whom he was powerless to expel.

“He disregarded all engagements, violated all treaties, laid waste the Dutch territory, and put their subjects to the sword; yet in spite of these atrocities, they addressed him with adulation, whilst he replied with studied contumely, and persisted in sending him embassies and presents, although he repelled their advances, and imprisoned and even executed their ambassadors.”

But we were hardly prepared to find the Dutch outdone in the national vice of meanness by Englishmen, proud imperial Englishmen, Englishmen of the old Roman type, Britons who never never would be slaves. Instance the following passage:—

“It is to be regretted that the postponement of national honour to commercial advantages, was not confined to Holland in the east; and the observance of the same humiliating policy, is to be found on a still greater scale in the early intercourse of the British East India Company with the Emperor of Delhi.

“There is nothing in the records of the Dutch more disgraceful than those official documents of the English in India at the beginning of the last century, who, in the name of ‘God,’ laid at the feet of the Great Mogul, *‘The supplication of the Governor of Bengal, whose forehead is his footstool,’* setting out *‘that the Englishmen trading to Bengal are his Majesty’s slaves, always intent upon doing his com-*

mands, and having readily obeyed his most sacred orders, have therefore found favour,' and they 'crave, as his servants, a firman for trade, and protection to follow their business without molestation.' Letter of Governor Russell, 15 September, 1712."

The slaves of the great Mogul, and the governors whose foreheads were his footstool, have indemnified themselves pretty largely, it must be admitted, for this worse than Dutch humiliation. They soon contrived to change places with the Emperor of Delhi; and we are not surprised to find them assume a perfectly dignified and lofty tone towards the Emperor, when they spoke from his palace after having appropriated his dominions. This much, however, may be said for the Englishmen trading to Bengal, that their meanness was un-English and exceptional, whereas the meanness of the Dutch was perfectly national and consistent.

Nor does it seem that the benefit of the population under their governments entered into the views of the Dutch.

"Throughout all the records which the Dutch have left us of their policy in Ceylon, it is painfully observable that no disinterested concern is manifested, and no measures directed for the elevation and happiness of the native population; and even where care is shown to have been bestowed upon the spread of education and religion, motives are apparent, either latent or avowed, which detract from the grace and generosity of the act. Thus, schools were freely established, but their avowed object was to wean the young Singhalese from their allegiance to the Emperor, and the better to impress them with the power and ascendancy of Holland. Churches were built because the extension of the Protestant faith was likely to counteract the influence of the Portuguese Roman Catholics, and the spread of Christianity, to discourage the Moors and Mahometan traders."

The comparative results of the Portuguese and Dutch policy, are thus summed up by Sir Emerson Tennent.

"The dominion of the Netherlands in Ceylon, was nearly equal in duration with that of Portugal, about one hundred and forty years; but the policies of the two countries have left a very different impress upon the character and institutions of the people amongst whom they lived. The most important bequest left by the utilitarian genius of Holland, is the code of Roman Dutch laws, which still prevails in the supreme courts of justice; whilst the fanatical propagandism of the Portuguese, has reared for itself a monument,

in the abiding and expanding influence of the Roman Catholic faith. This flourishes in every province and hamlet where it was implanted by the Franciscans, whilst the doctrines of the reformed Church of Holland, never preached beyond the walls of the fortresses, are now extinct throughout the island, with the exception of an expiring community at Colombo. Already the language of the Dutch which they sought to extent by penal enactments, has ceased to be spoken even by their direct descendants, whilst to the present day, a corrupted Portuguese is the vernacular of the middle classes, in every town of importance. As the practical government of the Netherlands only recognised the interests of the native population, in so far as they were essential to uphold their trading monopolies, their memory was recalled by no agreeable associations; whilst the Portuguese, who, in spite of their cruelties, were identified with the people by a common faith, excited a feeling of admiration by the boldness of their conflicts with the Kandians, and the chivalrous though ineffectual defence of their beleaguered fortresses. The Dutch and their proceedings have almost ceased to be remembered by the Lowland Singalese, but the chiefs of the south and west, perpetuate with pride, the honorific title of *Don*, accorded to them by their first European conquerors, and still prefix to their ancient patronymica, the sonorous Christian names of the Portuguese."

The Dutch Calvinists, as we have observed, subjected their Catholic countrymen, who were rather more than a third of the entire population of the Netherlands, to a comparatively mild, and to them, the Calvinists, a gainful persecution. Why slay them, banish them, or beggar them after the manner of the English Protestants? The Dutch Catholics were quiet people, well to do, and willing to pay for toleration; perhaps not unprepared to fight if driven to despair. To kill them would be like killing the hen that laid the golden eggs; to provoke them beyond all endurance would not be wise; and their high mightinesses never thought of anything so absurd. As soon as the provinces were declared independent, and the new religion having lost the charm of outlawry, became a respectable but common-place member of society, the republic took pleasure in the reformed faith, but without a touch of enthusiasm. The Dutchman liked his religion pretty much as he liked his vrow. Sir William Temple will by no means allow that a Dutchman ever was in love. There may have been a little heavy romance before marriage, but nothing else than cool realities came after it. In marrying his wife, he did not think it necessary to espouse all

her quarrels, or gratify her pretty whims. Just so in the matter of religion. The reformed faith would have dearly liked a holocaust of Papists, and perhaps upon abstract principles the Dutchman would have had no objection to meet her wishes, if it could be done with profit or for nothing. But as the profit was all the other way, he steadily refused. "You want me to get rid of the Catholics," he said to the Church, "but the Catholics pay me for letting them alone, and so long as they continue to pay, let them alone I must." This process of reasoning, however, applied to Holland only; circumstances were quite different in Ceylon, and there the Dutchman could persecute like any Englishman of them all. Accordingly, we learn from Sir Emerson Tennent, both in his present and in his former work, that the Dutch resorted to every means of persecution, other than death, in order to exterminate Catholicity from Ceylon. Nothing that ingenuity could shape for the purpose, in the nature of fines, disabilities, and vexations, was omitted. To particularize would be tiresome and disgusting. It is enough to say that the penal laws of Ceylon were not much less execrable than our own. The Portuguese and native Christians were subjected to them without intermission for one hundred and forty years, and as we see, without effect. The persecution in Ceylon was adopted for the one purpose of counteracting Portuguese influence, and without the smallest reference to the truth or error of any religion in particular. Throughout their occupation, the Dutch had the mortification of seeing the influences they were struggling to destroy, increase in breadth and power, until at length, when the island was wrested from them by England, they left Ceylon more Catholic than they had found it. The fidelity with which some classes of the Singhalese community have adhered to their religion since the days of Francis Xavier, is certainly not unexampled, but it will bear comparison with that of almost any other tribe or people. The fisher caste supplies one startling illustration of it, and puts Sir Emerson Tennent upon speculating how it comes to pass, that fishermen everywhere in India have been the earliest converts to Catholicity. "Elsewhere," he says in a note, "I have alluded to the singular fact that the fisher caste have been in every country in India the earliest converts to the Roman Catholic Church, so much so as to render it worthy of inquiry whether it be only a coincidence or the result of

.

some permanent and predisposing cause. The Parawas of Cape Comorin were the earliest converts of St. Francis Xavier. It was by the fisher caste of Manaar that he was invited to Ceylon in 1544, A.D. ; and notwithstanding the martyrdom inflicted on his converts by the Raja of Jaffna, and the continued persecution of the Dutch, that district is to the present day one of the strongholds of the Roman Catholic Church in Ceylon; and the fishermen along the whole of the south-western coast, as far south as Barborga, are in the proportion of one half Roman Catholics. Is it that there is an habitual tendency to veneration of the Supreme Being amongst those "who go down to the sea in ships and see His power in the great deep?" Is it that being a low caste themselves, the fishers of India and Ceylon acquire a higher status by espousing Christianity, or have they some sympathy with a religion whose first apostles and teachers were the fishermen of Galilee?"

Regarding the same "fisher caste," Sir Emerson Tennent again alludes in these volumes to a circumstance of which he had previously made mention in his "History of Christianity in Ceylon," and which we noticed at the time. The British Government having remitted the fish tax which had been imposed by the Portuguese and maintained by the Dutch, the fishermen, instead of profiting by the remission, hand over yearly the amount of the tax, and sometimes with increase, to the Catholic clergy. It appears also that the fisher caste does not, as its name implies, include fishermen alone, a portion of the caste having betaken itself to handicraft, and furnishing excellent carpenters, cabinet-makers, and workers in ebony.

In 1796 the Dutch power was brought to a close in Ceylon, by British forces in the Company's service, after a struggle not worth naming, if struggle it could be called, "*Nec illud prælium fuit.*" The British period did not begin with an assumption of sovereignty over the whole island. The East India Company merely stepped into the shoes of the Dutch, and held possession of the seaboard; although in the first instance the kings of Kandy declined to recognise them in any way, or to treat with any other party than the King of England. For two years the colony was governed from Madras, and governed in such a way as to provoke, what Sir Emerson Tennent calls a rebellion, although the word would seem to have no application to the circumstances. No sooner however was the

outbreak suppressed, than the colonial office decided that Ceylon should be governed from England, and Mr. North, afterwards the first Lord Guilford, landed in Ceylon as Governor, in October, 1798. In 1802, at the peace of Amiens, the island was formally incorporated with the British dominions; but it does not appear that the native sovereign was a consenting party to this arrangement.

Mr. North, like any man in the same circumstances, had two characters to fill. He was in Ceylon not merely as a governor, but as a diplomatist. Relations still subsisted between the Kings of Kandy and the Kings of England, as between power and power; and the territory actually under the rule of the governor something resembled the English pale in Ireland. If it be indeed the duty of a diplomatist "to act the liar in a foreign country for the benefit of his own," whatever may be thought of the office, Mr. North must be admitted to have filled it admirably. Never were there more tainted transactions than those in which, by his own disclosures, we find him engaged with the Adigar, or prime minister of the last King of Kandy. The immediate predecessor of Nikrema, Raja Singha, last King of Kandy, having been deposed through the intrigues of the Adigar, the same Adigar, Pilámé Taláwé, procured the election of the Queen's nephew to the kingly office, upon the death of the deposed prince without issue. He expected to find in the new king a ready instrument and an easy victim; and it does honour to his discrimination that he so thoroughly understood Mr. North's character, as to disclose to him without doubt or hesitation a treasonable project which he had formed for the deposition of the young king, and the substitution of himself, Pilámé Taláwé. Mr. North did not at once countenance and abet the project, for that would have been immoral; and what is more to the purpose, it would have been rash to do so; until it should be seen how much profit could be extracted from the immorality. Neither on the other hand did he denounce the treason to the king, for that would have been a violation of honour, which is known to exist even amongst thieves; and doubtless the communications of the Adigar were marked private. Mr. North, for his part, never could quite understand the conduct of Fabricius, under similar circumstances; and it had always appeared to him a gross breach of confidence on the side of the old

Roman to have disclosed the Doctor's secret to Pyrrhus. Everything considered, Mr. North determined to entertain the project, but in a Christian spirit. He stipulated, upright man, for the personal safety of the king. It was next arranged that Mr. North should proceed as ambassador to the court of Kandy, accompanied by 1000 men as an escort, which thousand might, by adroit management, be raised to 1800, or even to 2500, under the command of General MacDonnell. This force was to remain in the capital as a subsidized English garrison; and the king, being thus at the mercy of Mr. North and his worthy friend the Adigar, was to be induced to retire to Jaffna, and there live under British protection. Failing the consent of the king to the admission of this innocent guard of honour, the question was discussed and settled, as to what military aggression on the part of the Adigar, (under orders from the king, of course) upon British territory, would be considered a sufficient and decent pretext for war, to be followed by the occupation of Kandy.

The original project failed. The King, indeed, at first gave his consent to the arrangement, but taking alarm, subsequently withdrew it, and a very modest escort only was suffered to accompany the ambassador. The second project now came into play. The requisite act of aggression was committed by the Adigar, and war ensued according to agreement; ending in the occupation of Kandy by 3000 British troops. The king had already fled, and a puppet king was elected in his stead, whose first act was to instal the British force as a subsidized garrison in Kandy. Last of all, a convention was entered into with the Adigar, in virtue of which the late king was to be handed over to the English; the provisional king was to be sent to Jaffna; and "the illustrious Lord Piláné Taláwé," was to exercise supreme authority as Grand Prince of Kandy.

The "illustrious Lord," however, had one other treason in store which was to crown his success, and that was a treason to Mr. North. He determined to seize the governor, and to massacre the British garrison; to kill the two kings, and to ascend an undisputed throne. The plan succeeded in two of its parts. The British garrison, enfeebled by sickness, and reduced to a very small effective force, was overwhelmed by numbers; forced, after a brave resistance, to capitulate; then drawn into a decoy; and

finally massacred two by two, on the banks of the Mahawelliganga. The unfortunate Mootoo Saamy, whom we have called the Provisional King, was slain in the same place. One man only escaped the carnage. During the interval of twelve years, between 1803 and 1815, the British forces were too weak to attempt any complete or signal act of vengeance. After the massacre of the garrison in the capital, and the flight of other small garrisons, not a single British soldier remained in the Kandyan territories; and the king having escaped the toils of the "illustrious Lord," resumed his throne, and became thenceforward, the most savage tyrant that had stained the Kandyan annals; as well as the most determined enemy of England. Between 1805 and 1815, there existed, at times, a kind of hollow peace; and Pilámé Taláwé, having been detected in a conspiracy against the life of the King, received the reward of all his treasons, by decapitation, in 1812.

Strange to say, his nephew was promoted to the post of Adigar; but it seemed as if conspiracy was hereditary in the family. The new Adigar opened a treasonable correspondence with Sir Robert Brownrigg, the governor, but his treason was discovered, and although he escaped to Colombo, his wife and children remained in the hands of the tyrant, who put them to death under circumstances of the most cruel and disgusting barbarity. At length, in 1815, war was declared, and in the course of a few weeks, the tyrant was a captive in Colombo, from whence he was removed to the fortress of Vellore, in continental India, where he died.

The correspondence of Mr. North with his own government is, if possible, even more disreputable than the transactions to which it referred. We almost pitied Lord Cornwallis, when we learned from his correspondence, how his stomach kicked at the nasty business to which he was obliged to set his hand in the bad neighbourhood of Cork Hill, and College Green. He had a genuine disgust for his work; but Mr. North's correspondence, if you except a few slight and conventional apologies, betrays nothing like real dislike for the multiplied treasons, lies, and corruptions, in which he was engaged. Fortunately, there is no need of instruments like Mr. North, or rather, we should say, no scope for them, in the present state of Ceylon. They never could have been needed. For some years the

Singhalese, although they had formally assented to the sovereignty of the English crown under certain conditions, remained very impatient of our government; and, strange to say, the revolutions of 1848, were not without their effect upon Singhalese society; so strong, even if not indestructible, is the principle of nationality. Since the English government became firmly established in Ceylon, it seems to have been kindly and beneficent in its operation. The island has been intersected with noble roads; and the restoration of some of the great tanks is contemplated; and even railways are in process of construction. Industry is favoured by peace, and religious liberty is protected by the law, although perhaps not always in the same degree by its administration. No man's conscience, at least, is forced, and on the whole, perhaps, our brother Catholics are as well off in Ceylon as we are at home. We have not adverted to much that is interesting in Sir Emerson Tennent's work, such as the description of Adam's Peak, of the Plain of Neura Ellia, and of the climate and scenery of each of the provinces. In truth, the merest allusion to the various subjects which he has treated with such fulness would run into a downright catalogue. But the work has already a good index of its own, and to that index let the reader be referred. He may take, almost at random, any of the heads before him, and he may read under it with very little risk of weariness or disappointment.

ART. V.—1. *The Unity of Worlds and of Nature. Three Essays* by the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. Second Edition. London: Longman. 1856.

2. *Christianity without Judaism.* By the Rev. Baden Powell, &c. London: Longman. 1857.

3. *The Order of Nature considered in reference to the Claims of Revelation.* By the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A., F. R. S., F. R. A. S., F. G. S., Savilian Professor of Geometry, in the University of Oxford. London: Longman. 1859.

WHAT a strange thing is that compound of discordant creeds and conflicting dogmas which is not

inappropriately designated Protestantism! The name, luckily, does not impose anything positive on true believers; their bond of union is purely negative; all those who reject

“The faith their fathers held to God,”

make excellent Protestants. From the old definition of a true Christian, that he is “one who believes the Scriptures and hates the Pope,” the first clause must be expunged. The last is all that is now required. A man may deny the Scriptures—reject the whole Christian code—laugh at the idea of an overruling providence, and openly proclaim his disbelief, even in the existence of an Omnipotent God, provided he entertains a sufficient horror for everything, however remotely connected with the ancient faith. We have seen, within the last few months, the capital of Protestantism, the citadel of its orthodoxy, the great city of London, agitated to its very centre, on account of the chaunt of a psalm, the cut of a gown, or the colour of a surplice. The abomination was too much for Protestant orthodoxy; the service was interrupted by the most unseemly and irreverent noises; the minister and choristers were treated with violence, and the police could scarcely protect them from personal injury. Lawyers talked, magistrates fined, the press thundered, the bishop remonstrated, all in vain. Sunday after Sunday the Church of St. George was turned into a cock-pit. The great Lilliputian war regarding which end of the egg should be broken was nothing to it. And yet, during this very time, another minister, holding the high position of a professor in the University of Oxford, scarcely excites a passing remark, by publicly rejecting first the Old, and then the New Testament, by denying the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord, and by destroying, as far as he can, all rational belief, even in the existence of a God. The old inscription over the gates of Bandon, might now serve as the motto of Protestantism—

“Jew, Turk, or Atheist, may enter here,
But not a Papist.”

Under which Dean Swift wrote—

“Whoever has written this has written well,
For the same is written on the gates of hell.”

What a change has come over the great University of Oxford since her most eminent men stood forth as the champions of Church authority, and of ancient Christianity. The Puseyites, like grey-haired Saturn, are silent as a stone, and the field is solely occupied by one of their evangelical opponents, who proclaims a scripture without inspiration, a Christian religion without a miracle, and an Order of Nature without a God! We feel that these are very serious charges, not against Mr. Powell, but against the Protestant religion, because he takes care to inform us in the very preface to one of his books, that his views are truly Protestant, and perfectly consistent with the formularies of the Church of England.

“In many instances,” says Mr. Powell,* “the Christian doctrines have been formerly maintained in close connection with *physical* ideas, while *those* ideas, and the views taken of them, must of necessity, be liable to change and improvement, as science advances. And if some expressions, apparently implying such connexion, are retained in the formularies of the Church of England, which thus acquire a modified interpretation, it must also be observed that many points, of great importance, are there left without any determination or mention. Thus, to whatever extent individual, or even general, opinion may have given a turn to such questions, they are undeniably perfectly open questions to those who adopt these formularies. Of this class, are the entire subjects of philosophical theism, or natural theology;—the evidences of Christianity;—the immateriality of the soul;—and the nature of miracles.”

To Catholics who have been accustomed to the cry of the Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible, it must be something startling to find, on such high authority, that the very inspiration of the Bible is an open question. Nor can it be said that these are merely the opinions of an individual, because in this very passage the Rev. Professor, who was one of the leaders of the Evangelical, or Low Church party in Oxford, during the controversies which arose out of the publication of the Tracts for the Times; and who remembers how Mr. Ward was stripped of his gown on account of the publication of his “Ideal of a Christian Church,” throws down the gauntlet, and defies convocation to take it up. We certainly entertain no personal hostility against Mr. Powell,

* Order of Nature, preface vii. viii.

we merely regard him as the exponent of what he assures us are the prevalent doctrines amongst the most enlightened class of Protestants, and which are undeniably tolerated even in the Anglican Church. Treating of the nature and attributes of God, Mr. Powell says : *

“The actual claims of moral science to establish a foundation for these more sublime truths, are very slight: the old *a priori* metaphysical theistic argument, and schemes of divine perfections, (especially from the exhaustive criticisms of Khant,) have been generally discredited, not only by philosophers, but by the admission of the most orthodox divines; in the views of the same kind which others have sought to substitute, we can find little which seems more satisfactory. To attempt to reason from law to volition, from order to active power, from universal reason to distinct personality, from design to self-existence, from intelligence to infinite perfection, is, in reality, to adopt grounds of argument and speculation entirely beyond those of strict philosophical inference, and it would be more consistent openly to avow the insufficiency of scientific views for realising those loftier contemplations and theistic conceptions, than to gloss over the difficulty by an ambiguous and metaphysical phraseology; and owning the inadequacy of reason to recur to faith. And, in fact, the most candid of such reasoners usually, in the end, fall back on the simple appeal to the common feeling and general religious sense of mankind *in the belief in a deity*, an appeal which, however, just in itself, is simply a confession of the insufficiency of philosophical reasoning—the only point in dispute.”

Thus, according to Mr. Powell, the most orthodox and most candid divines admit, that the *existence of God* cannot be proved *by reason*, but by faith,—a faith, be it remembered, not founded on reason, but on common feeling and religious sense,—a faith which is not derived from the word of God, since no such word exists, a faith therefore, which is pure moonshine. But let us hear what follows :

“The firm conception of the immutability of order (that is, that there can be no real miracle) is the first rudiment in all scientific foundation for Cosmo-theology (whatever that means). Our conclusion cannot go beyond the assumption in our evidence. Our argument can lead us only to such limited notions of the divine attributes, as are consistent with the principle of ‘Cosmos’ (whom we take to be a near relation of Sergeant Buzfuz). If we speak of wisdom,

* Order of Nature, p. 243.249.

it is as evinced in the laws of profoundly adjusted reason ; if of 'power,' it is only in the conception of universal and eternal maintenance of those arrangements ; if of 'infinite intelligence,' it is as manifested throughout the infinity of nature ; and to whose dominion we can imagine no limit, as we can imagine none to natural order....The simple argument, from the invariable order of nature, is wholly incompetent to give us any conception whatever of the Divine Omnipotence, except as maintaining, or acting through, that invariable universal system of physical order and law. Any belief which may be entertained of a different kind must essentially belong to an order of things wholly beyond any conclusions derived from physical philosophy, or Cosmo-theology. A theism of omnipotence in any sense deviating from the order of nature, must be entirely derived from other teaching : in fact it is commonly traceable to early religious impressions, not from any real deductions of reason, but from the language of the Bible... The Supernatural is the offspring of ignorance, and the parent of superstition and idolatry (?) : the Natural is the assurance of science, and the preliminary to all rational views of Theism...It is a mistake to confound with the deductions of science, these more sublime conceptions and elevated spiritual views of a Deity,—a personal God,—an Omnipotent Creator,—a moral Governor,—a Being of infinite spiritual perfections, holding relations with the spirit of man ;—the object of worship, trust, fear, and love ;—all which conceptions can originate only from some other source than physical philosophy. These are conclusions which science must confess entirely to transcend its powers, as they are beside its province, to substantiate."

Now, unless reason can clearly establish the existence of a personal God—of a God to be feared, worshipped, and loved—in some way or other, either from nature itself, or from supernatural revelation, confirmed by supernatural interference, by miracle or prophecy, there can be no demonstration at all of the existence of God. When Mr. Powell thrusts his tongue into his cheek and tells us that those *sublime truths*, such as the existence of God, can be proved neither by reason nor by revelation, but must rest on *religious faith*, he cannot expect us to believe him to be serious. But, indeed, Mr. Powell leaves us in no doubt, either as regards his own views, or those of "some of the most orthodox divines."

"Some of the most orthodox divines," he assures us, "denounce 'the pride of unsanctified intellect, irreverently intruding its criticisms into what ought to be veiled in religious reserve:' by consequence the miracles and the records of them would be sheltered from criticism, and thus virtually removed from the province of

history, to be placed within the pale of *religious faith*. Thus, then, theologians seem practically to approach towards the view of miraculous narratives, as compositions whose proper object is not so much the *events* they relate, as the *doctrine* and *instruction* they embody, and thus approximate in principle to the mystic theory. While philosophy is freely allowed its proper dominion in regulating general physical views, and criticism in sifting documentary evidence, faith is duly recognised in the acceptance of truths, which, from their nature, could not be objects of scientific knowledge, and are not affected by the *decisions* or doubts of criticism. The literal sense of physical events, impossible to science, cannot be essential to *spiritual truth*; nor have contraventions to natural order any necessary connection with *vital Christianity*. The philosophic thinker, whatever view he takes of any, or all, of the rationalistic speculations, will perceive that the grand inductive principle of the immutable uniformity of natural causes,—the sole substantial ground for belief in a supreme moral cause,—must ever remain unassailed; and firmly grasping this broad principle on the one hand, and perceiving the essential spirituality of Christianity on the other,—he will repose on these convictions, and admit that the *miraculous narrations of the Gospel* may be received for the divine instruction they were designed to convey, without prejudice to the inviolable laws of physiology, of gravitation, or of the constitution of matter.”*

Again:

“But it must in fairness be added, that what is here remarked is no imputation on the *reality* or *earnestness* of a religious belief founded on such a traditional basis. The spirit of *faith*,—so nearly allied to the æsthetic and imaginative faculties of our nature,—*may* be most *fervently* and *sincerely* associated with what is *fabulous* or *mythical*, or *may* attach itself to a *high spiritual truth* under the *outward imagery* of a marvellous narrative. It has even been contended that mystery and parable are *more* truly congenial to the nature of faith than *fact and history*, which are rather subjects of reason and knowledge, far below the aspirations of the spiritual mind.”†

The obvious purport of this passage is, that the spiritual aspirations of the mind soar far beyond the regions of reason, of knowledge, and therefore of truth, and find their proper objects in the higher world of faith, of fiction, and of marvels. But, to proceed with our extracts.

* Order of Nature, p. 376-7.

† Ibid. 427-8.

“From what has preceded it appears that while the difficulties of miracles are fully seen, if not explicitly avowed by some theologians, the acceptance of them is regarded purely as a matter of religious faith and spiritual apprehension, not as a point of reason, or a deduction of the intellect,—to which they admit it is even opposed. And thus this confession on the side of religion entirely concurs and harmonises with the verdict of philosophy, which, if it fail to recognize physical interruption, freely acknowledges spiritual influence and the power of faith; and where its own dominion ends, cordially recognises the landmarks of the neighbour territory, and allows that what is not a subject for a problem may hold its place in a creed. In a past age, as we have already noticed, great stress was laid on certain precise, evidential arguments, especially turning on inference from miracles. The exclusive, or even principal, importance of this class of *proofs*, has in later times been greatly called in question, *even by* orthodox theologians, who have evinced a disposition to recede much from formal arguments, addressed to the intellect, and to prefer an appeal to spiritual conviction and religious sense. . . . Thus, on every ground, from the nature of the case, from the arguments of the learned, from the practical confessions of the unlearned, from the admissions of the orthodox, and the controversies of the heterodox,—on the combined considerations of the remarks last made, and the facts and authorities formerly cited,—we can only arrive at the conclusion that the belief in miracles, whether in ancient or modern times, has always been a point, *not of evidence* addressed to the *intellect*, but of *religious faith* impressed on the *spirit*. The mere fact was nothing: however well attested, it might be set aside: however fabulous, it might be accepted—according to the predisposing religious persuasion of the parties. If a more philosophical survey tend to ignore suspensions of nature, as inconceivable to reason, the spirit of faith gives a different interpretation, and transfers miracles to the more congenial region of spiritual contemplation and divine mystery.”*

We shall hereafter notice the evidence of miracles, but we cannot pass over the shallow disingenuousness of the last sentences which we have just quoted. When he asserts that the *mere fact*—that is, its truth or falsehood—was nothing, because, however well attested, it might be set aside, and however fabulous, it might be accepted, he has omitted one word which appears to us to be of some little importance. It is quite true that a fact, however well attested, may be *unreasonably* rejected; however fabulous and ill attested, it may be *unreasonably* accept-

* Order of Nature, p. 429-440.

ed, but if this argument would prove that the fact itself was nothing, it would put an end to all history, all philosophy, all truth. It is equally false to assert that miracles, whether ancient or modern, were received or rejected, according to the religious persuasion of the parties. Prejudice, no doubt, is very powerful with regard to matters of *opinion*, but great numbers of persons, men and women, at different times and on different occasions, many of them possessing strong and well-informed minds, do not sacrifice everything, even liberty and life, for the purpose of testifying that they were actual witnesses of facts which never occurred at all. Take, for instance, the case of the death and resurrection of our Lord. Had any imposture been intended, would He have predicted that He would rise again within the space of three days? His enemies had only to make sure of His death, and to take care that the body was not removed during the brief period of three days. Does any one believe that those relentless enemies who vociferated for His blood, did not make themselves certain that He was really dead, or that having obtained a guard to watch the sepulchre, because that seductor had said whilst living, after three days I will rise again, they did not take care to see that the body was in the sepulchre before they sealed it; or finally, that the Apostles, one of whom had betrayed and another denied his Master, would have approached the guards with the desperate hope of stealing away the body, without being perceived either by the soldiers or by the Jews? At all events the charitable insinuation that the Apostles might have been deceived as to the fact of their Master's death is utterly absurd. If they *stole* His body in a state of suspended animation, or in any state whatever, they knew that they were impostors.

So also with regard to the facts of the resurrection and ascension. They declared that He appeared to Magdalen, to the other women, to Peter, to the two disciples, to the Apostles, when Thomas was absent, and again when he was present, and that He ascended in the presence of more than five hundred brethren. Mr. Powell does not believe in ghosts, but our Lord proved the reality of His bodily resurrection, by speaking with His Apostles, eating with them, and making them touch and see that a spirit had not flesh and bones as He had. He afterwards appeared to St. Paul, on the road to Damascus. The Apostles could

not have been misled as to these facts: either the facts are true, or the Apostles are (as St. Paul declares, 1 Cor. xv.) false witnesses and impostors. The fact is, our senses are just as capable of judging of miraculous facts, as of any other facts whatever, and a number of persons, who are in the full enjoyment of their reason, can no more be deceived with regard to the reality of the return of a dear and intimate friend from the grave, who has only been absent three days, who associates with them during the light of day, talks with them as of old, eats with them and touches them, than they could be deceived as to the reality and identity of the same person, if, without being dead, he had returned after an equally short absence.

Secondly, it is utterly untrue that the Jews or Gentiles, who became converts, were led by their religious convictions, to receive as realities, except after the most severe examination, the miracles of our Lord and of His Apostles. They were both, on the contrary, most violently prejudiced against our Lord. The Jews had hoped for a great king and temporal deliverer; the Gentiles despised the Jews and their religion, and nothing but the irresistible truth of the miracles could have united them together in the Christian Church.

Thirdly, it is not true that even the unbelieving Jews denied the reality of our Lord's miracles. On the contrary, they said of some of them, it is manifest and we cannot deny. Even Mr. Powell says "the Pharisees did not *at all deny* the miracles of Christ, but set them down to the influence of *evil spirits*."* He adds, "That though accepted by properly disposed minds, they were rejected by others." This is not true: they did not ascribe our Lord's miracles, generally, to evil spirits, but only the casting out of devils, and on this point He silenced them. We shall explain hereafter how it occurred, that though they could not deny the miracles—that though all were forced to admit their truth—yet many obstinately rejected our Lord and His doctrine.

We must guard our readers against another assertion contained in our last extracts from Mr. Powell. No doubt they must have been astonished to learn that the "*invariable* uniformity of natural causes," or in other words,

* Order of Nature, p. 435.

the denial of all miracles, is the sole substantial ground for belief in a supreme moral cause. Of this we shall say something before we conclude: our immediate object is to show them, that by this "supreme moral cause," Mr. Powell does not mean God. Having quoted some expressions of Stirling, who says, "everything within nature has a physical cause," he adds:

"This I think does justify us in contending that nature as a whole has a moral cause;—it is the very evidence of it. The notion of a moral cause, to which I refer, is nothing else than what arises necessarily out of the conception of the vast assemblage and orderly combinations of physical causes. As to any idea of personality, power, or moral attributes, all these I entirely agree, must be derived from quite other sources, as they are conceptions of a totally different order."*

He continues:—

"If indeed the author (Stirling) meant simply to transfer the belief in a Deity altogether from the domain of *reason*, to place it in that of *spirit*, to found it on the sole consciousness of internal emotion, or the intuitive impressions of individual experience, this would be a view to which the philosophical argument offers no disparagement, though it does not reach up to it. *A personal God, a moral governor of the world*, the Divine Will and Power originating material things, and calling forth intellectual and spiritual life, are doctrines not of science, but of faith, and repose on the same ground as all other religious doctrines. As to the nature of these grounds, they will necessarily be different in the case of different individual minds. But in point of fact it is, I imagine, the case that by far the larger majority derive such conceptions from the language of the Bible, instilled into their ears and memory from earliest childhood; though doubtless there are many who adopt them from higher spiritual impressions and internal feelings and convictions, but in either case from sources wholly distinct from the teachings of science."†

A little further on (p. 162) he says, Newton's notion that planetary perturbations would require a special interference for restoring the equilibrium, was applauded as the only (?) satisfactory acknowledgment of a superior power. "We merely ask, *If this be the true argument, what now becomes of the conclusion?*" the italics are the author's. So also he prophesies will the geological

* Unity of Worlds, p. 136, note.

† Unity of Worlds, p. 157-8.

argument, which can only explain the abrupt introduction of new species and genera into the world of organized beings, by the interference of a supernatural cause, fall to the ground, when future discovery shall disclose the connection between the apparently abrupt changes in the order of organized beings. It is not that the author rejects particular arguments which have been usually adduced to prove the existence of a Supreme Being, whilst he relies upon others; he rejects them all not merely as unsatisfactory, but as absolutely false; and having maintained that there are no reasonable grounds for believing in a personal God, he asserts that the supernatural is the parent of idolatry.

It seems, after this, almost superfluous, to notice the author's opinions regarding scripture and inspiration. In fact, he has written a book (*Christianity without Judaism*) to prove that the representations of the creation, deluge, and other scriptural narratives of a physical kind are utterly false, and that the real reply to objections taken from them is, "that Christianity is not implicated in them, and that they are wholly peculiar to the Judaic religion, with which Christianity has been too commonly mixed up and confused." (Introduction, p. 5.) He then proceeds to deprecate the conduct of those theologians who endeavour to reconcile the truths of Geology with the Old Testament, and declares that no attempt at reconciliation can hold its ground in the face of the better information now universally diffused. (p. 14.)

Of course no person could have been imposed on by such a shallow pretence; these portions of the Old Testament being constantly referred to as literal facts in the New. The author himself has, it appears, at length discovered this, and acknowledges in his recent work, "*The Order of Nature*,"* that the Christian Scriptures have borrowed these doctrines from the Jewish. He then enumerates several scriptural statements of, he is pleased to say, an apparently physical kind, such as have reference to the state of our first parents in Paradise, which he declares to be fabulous, because physical death is the necessary condition of animal existence in this world, as the slightest reflection must show that immortality of the body on this

* P. 444, et seq.

earth would be simply a physical impossibility. (p. 445.) Of course he pays no attention, does not even condescend to notice the statement that life was to be preserved by means of divine interposition. In the same page he informs us that the discovery of chloroform has practically annulled the Mosaic denunciation on parturition. In order to effect this it should be applied in every instance, its application should never be attended with danger, and it should remove all the suffering and peril, before and after, as well as in the act of parturition, for to all these does the curse clearly extend. Regarding the descent of the whole human race from a single pair, he says, "Though there can be little doubt that the writers of the New Testament held the common belief of their countrymen on this point, as derived from the Mosaic writings, yet they no where lay any stress upon it; nor would the spiritual and practical doctrines they found upon it be in the least invalidated, even if the opinion of a diversity of race, so much advocated by some philosophers, should eventually be proved."* Our Lord Himself, (Matt. x. 19), and St. Paul, (Rom. v.), put forth this statement as a literal fact, and ground their reasoning entirely upon its truth. But Mr. Powell is clearly of opinion that they knew nothing about the matter. They adopted the statement of Moses, whose physical statements are usually false. It is quite clear that he regards himself as a much cleverer fellow, not only than Moses, but even than the Apostles or our Lord Himself.

"We find," he says, "numerous references and allusions, more or less direct, in the New Testament, to the physical statements and representations of the Old; such as to the creation, the account of Adam and Eve, the deluge, the Mosaic and prophetic miracles, and the like. In general it may be supposed admitted, that such references would be made by the Apostles and Evangelists, as Jews, in the literal acceptance of their contemporaries. Various expressions of the sacred writers, *literally* of a peculiar *physical* import, in accordance with the ideas of their age, obviously cannot now be understood in the same sense, or possess the same force in the existing state of knowledge."†

* Order of Nature, p. 447.

† Ibid. p. 447-8.

Regarding a future life, the author assures us that its announcement, as well as

“That of the manner and circumstances in which it is predicted to take place, forming, as it does, so prominent a topic in the New Testament, is delivered in terms, no doubt, directly derived from material objects, and expressive of physical agency, which may reasonably be supposed as a mode of representing unseen mysteries to human apprehension by sensible imagery, and in their literal sense can no more be insisted on than the literal period of their occurrence, so undeniably assigned in the apostolic writings, as then close at hand.” (p. 450.)

That many Christians thought the end of the world at hand, is quite true, but it is so far from being true that it is contained in the Apostolic writings, that St. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians for the express purpose of disabusing them of their false impression on this point. (2 Thess. ii. 2.) Mr. Powell adds, that though “we do not know the changes which matter and life may undergo, (naturally of course), yet these must fall infinitely short of those elevated contemplations—rather are of a wholly different order from any ideas of a future state to which Christianity points; and which are wholly incomprehensible to human reason, and exclusively the embodiments of revelation and objects of faith;” neither of which, be it remembered, prove the real physical existence of their objects, but, on the contrary, are the pure embodiments of our own internal feelings and religious aspirations.

The future life being thus a mere shadow, of course its “representations are put forth in the New Testament in a sense wholly different from that of any philosophical speculations on an *immaterial* or *immortal principle existing in man*, and in no way dependent on the question of materialism or immaterialism. It is spoken of in spiritual language as ‘a mystery,’ (1 Cor. xv. 51.) which conveys no ideas congisable to reason; and the whole doctrine, as delivered by the Apostle, is altogether alien from any philosophical views whatsoever, physical or metaphysical, and is wholly *the creation* of inspiration, the teaching of faith.” (p. 451.) Inspiration and faith, as understood by Mr. Powell, are the media for conveying not real physical or metaphysical truths, but imaginary feelings, “airy nothings.” He admits that this doctrine of a future life is expressly made of the most fundamental importance by the

Apostle, (1 Cor. xv.) although the precise nature of the event spoken of is not in the slightest degree hinted at. The metaphor of the seed sown, and the plant springing up from it, has manifestly no analogy with a material body and an immaterial soul. He then refers to St. Paul's appeal to our Lord's resurrection, and continues,

"In such representations there is no parallel in *reason*; they can be accepted solely as matters of *faith* and *revelation*, in the sense put on them by the Apostle. Such instances only show how entirely spiritual mysteries must stand on their own ground, and can be in no way amenable to any natural comparisons or material conceptions. They are matters necessarily *unsatisfactory to curiosity, unapproachable by reason, yet sufficient for faith—and for practice.*"—p. 451-2.

He must have given a quiet wink when he wrote the last words. Having thus disposed of the resurrection of the body, and treated St. Paul as a very silly logician, he proceeds to *get rid* of the soul entirely. He informs us that any expressions of the New Testament writers, which seem to imply the existence of a distinct spiritual principle in man, nowhere assert it in any precise or physiological sense. The material and immaterial theories of metaphysicians, he contends, affect in no way the doctrines of Christianity. "So long as man is admitted to have the capacity for receiving, and the power of acting in accordance with Divine inspirations, (from whom these are derived he does not condescend to inform us,) it is wholly irrelevant whether his constitution be believed to consist of material atoms, or of immaterial entities, or a combination of both." (p. 452-3.) It is not necessary to point out the unblushing falsehood of these assertions, which are contradicted by every page of that Scripture to which he accords a delightfully convenient spiritual belief. But in another of his works (the Order of Nature,) he gives us his own, and therefore, of course, the real philosophical opinion of man's nature. He there entirely ignores the doctrine, that it is the soul which animates the body—if the soul be regarded as a distinct spiritual principle. "Some philosophers," he says, "have represented animated beings as in fact nothing more than *walking galvanic batteries*," which, as well as all similar theories, *may be false.* (p. 68.) "But all this in no way affects the conviction of the existence of some physical principle, the cause of the vital func-

tious, as yet indeed unknown, but which," he assures us, "will at some future time become as well known as the principle of respiration or the circulation of the blood." Any amount of Cosmical prophecy is preferable to the simple and plain revelation of Scripture. Even the fact that chemical analysis, which has reduced organized products to determinated elements, has never been able to produce an organic substance, or to invest an organic substance with life; and the remembrance of the ridicule which Messrs. Crosse and Weekes drew down upon themselves by declaring that they had evolved insect life by galvanism, does not deter him from prophesying that mankind may yet be discovered to be natural magnets in breeches and crinolines.

Here, then, is this grand idea, as we are assured, of enlightened modern Protestant Christianity! Man without a soul, without a Creator, (except Cosmos,) without responsibility, without a future life; Faith without truth; Religion without a God. Oh! we beg pardon, any one who must have a God, may make one to suit his own imagination, provided he does not believe him to be self-existent, or a creator, both which ideas are equally and hopelessly beyond the possible grasp of the human faculties (255); provided also He be not supposed to be the author of life which flows from some great unknown law of Cosmos, who also varies the species when convenient, (253) and finally provided He be not supposed able to exercise any power over the material world, as some ignorant persons formerly reasoned, that He who created nature, could, (not when *necessary*, or to *meet emergencies*, at least in the sense in which Mr. Powell adroitly puts those words into their mouths, but) when He pleases, suspend its laws. (292.) We prefer doing without a God at all to accepting such an imbecile as this from the manufactory of Powell, Cosmos and Co. Shades of Apostles and Martyrs, was this the chimera for which you died, was it this you substituted for Paganism?

One or two matters, however, still disturb the author's serenity—the introduction of life, the change of species, and the allegation of miracles. If Cosmos has not been able to do the two first, but has derived them from a supernatural power, and if he has been sometimes rudely interrupted by the last, it is clear, after all, that he is but the slave of a high overruling power.

Regarding the first point Powell says the vital powers were contained in nature, and evolved out of it like magnetic and galvanic forces. Now, according to the true inductive principle which he talks of, *usque ad nauseam*, no hypothesis for the explanation of natural phenomena can be admitted unless the cause can be shown to have real existence, and to be capable of producing the phenomena which it is put forward to explain. We have already shown, even on the admission of our adversaries, that there is no known cause in nature capable of producing an organized being, much less of endowing it with life. To assert, therefore, that any power in nature is capable of producing organized living beings, is manifestly contrary to the whole spirit of the inductive principle.

Mr. Powell does not deny that this world was once a globe of fire, in which no living thing, whether vegetable or animal, could exist. How, then, was life first introduced into it? The smallest blade of grass, the most minute animalcule, can only be produced by its own kind. The first introduction could not have come from Cosmos, it must have been the act of supernatural power.

When Mr. Powell speaks of the introduction of new species, he first abuses all who will not agree with his silly and godless inventions, calling them obstinately prejudiced and bigoted. According to him the whole choice lies between "the production of new forms, either out of inorganic matter *directly*, or by modification of existing organized types *indirectly*.*" The italics are the authors. According to the first theory Mr. Powell should not be astonished if he found his boots, some fine morning, in a lively conversation, having assumed some intermediate appearance between a man and a monkey, or if the soap were to change into a baboon, and grin at him out of the basin. According to the last a man's genealogy might be traced from a pea, which, in process of time became an onion, then a cabbage, until at length it reached the dignity of an oyster, and after its descendants had enjoyed themselves for some millions of years in the briny element, one of them at length took to the land, and finally became a man. When Boswell tried to defend Lord Monboddo, who held that men once had tails,

* Order of Nature, p. 173.

by quoting Rousseau for the same opinion, Johnson replied: "Sir, Rousseau knows that he is talking nonsense, but I am afraid Monboddo does not." We are really afraid poor Mr. Powell does not know what rank nonsense he and others of his school write.

But, miracles may be said to be his greatest abomination. He will not hear of any interference with his beloved Cosmos, because he knows that this must proceed from a power which is above nature, that it must lead, not only indirectly, by establishing the truths of revelation, but even directly to a Supreme Ruler of the Universe, to a Personal and omnipotent God.

A miracle is a sensible operation contrary to the ordinary course of nature, and produced by the intervention of a supernatural cause.

We do not here assume that this operation is possible, we simply say that this is the genuine idea of that miracle, the possibility of which Mr. Powell denies, and the actual and frequent occurrence of which we affirm. When we say that a miracle must be a *sensible operation*—or an event, the occurrence of which can be proved by the testimony of our senses, we speak of it as an evidence of divine communication. Invisible miracles, such as the Virginal Conception, are so far from supplying proofs of other doctrines, that their own credibility must be supported by the evidence of sensible miracles.

To explain the words contrary to the ordinary course of nature, it will not be necessary to discuss the theory of causation. When using the ordinary language "of cause and effect," in relation to the laws of nature, we do not require more than Mr. Powell grants, *inviolable or unconditional sequence*,* although it would not be difficult to show that this discovery of Hume, notwithstanding the patching of Mill, Powell, and Co., is utterly rotten and worthless.

Fire invariably produces heat, and never cold, it makes water boil, and never causes it to freeze, it always burns, and causes the death of any animal sufficiently exposed to its action. A man, once certainly dead, never opens the grave and comes back to life again. From the certainty and uniformity of these phenomena, or appearances of

* Unity of Worlds, p. 123.

nature, we deduce by analogy general rules by which we foresee what will occur in the ordinary course of things. Hence, if a person who was certainly dead and buried, should come to life again, this event would be contrary to the ordinary course of nature. We also know that such an event could not be caused by nature, but by some power, able to suspend the ordinary course of nature, and acting contrary to it in that particular instance. Such a power, notwithstanding the cavils of Archbishop Whateley, is correctly called supernatural, because it is above nature and has power over it.

“It was formerly a popular argument,” says Mr. Powell, “that He who created nature can, *when necessary*, suspend it, or, to meet *emergencies*, adopt extraordinary measures; as if ‘emergencies’ could occur to omniscience, or ‘necessity’ to omnipotence!”* Certainly no emergencies can occur to omniscience, nor is this supposed in miracles. When the Omnipotent established the ordinary course of nature, He did not do so blindly, nor without foreseeing all its consequences. Amongst these He foresaw that it would be wise to interrupt this course on some particular occasions, in order to accredit His messengers to mankind, and in order also to show that nature, however vast and wonderful, is a mere creature over which He exercises supreme power. The interruptions of the order of nature are not after-thoughts; they were foreseen and decreed when the order itself was established. Nor were these decrees of interruption necessary. God need not send messengers at all; or if He did, His infinite wisdom could supply other means of proving that they came from Him. But Mr. Powell’s books are sufficient evidence, that these interruptions are wise and useful, because they are evidences mercifully vouchsafed to us, of His existence, of His power, and of His providence.

That our definition is admitted by those who reject as well as those who admit miracles is manifest, because the whole question is, can or does any supernatural power ever produce particular results contrary to the ordinary course of nature? The sentence last quoted proves that this is Mr. Powell’s idea of what would constitute a miracle. Again (Order of Nature, p. 212.) he talks of

* Order of Nature, p. 292.

the “ever-increasing conviction of the *universality* and *immutability* of natural order.” A little further on (Ib. p. 258) he says: “I adverted to the case of some who have imagined the possibility of *occasional interruptions* in the grand scheme of universal order, law, and causation, thus producing as far as they might extend, a corresponding interruption and contravention to the evidence of supreme intelligence. Such ideas can only occur to those who have failed to grasp the great inductive principle of invariable uniformity and law in nature.”

From these passages it is clear that Mr. Powell utterly rejects the possibility of miracles, and in fact he considers the impossibility of deducing them from the established order of nature a sufficient *a priori* argument for their rejection, without at all entering into the question of testimony. On this point he presses his Protestant friends very hard. After stating their common belief that “the age of miracles has ceased,” he asks, (p. 259)

“Why, then, do men (Protestants) so universally and habitually discredit the occurrence of miracles at the present day? . . . It is *hardly even a question of evidence*; the generality of mankind (Protestants) habitually assume antecedently that miracles are now inadmissible; and hence, that in any reported case they must be in some manner explained away. . . .”

And again:

“Of old the sceptic professed he would be convinced by *seeing* a miracle. At the present day, a *visible miracle would be the very subject of his scepticism*. It is not the *attestation*, but the *nature* of the alleged marvel, which is now the point in question. It is not the *fallibility* of human testimony, but the *infallibility* of natural order, which is now the ground of argument: and modern science cannot conceive religious truth confirmed by a violation of physical truth.”

Begging his pardon, he here assumes the whole question, that a particular event, contrary to the ordinary course of nature, is a violation of physical truth. When, from our very limited experience of those who have died and been buried, not coming to life again, we infer by analogy, that there is a general law, by virtue of which, no dead person comes to life again, (a law by the way which we might learn by testimony) the inference is only legitimate when it is understood, that no dead person comes to life again *naturally*. If, from our experience

that no dead person comes to life again, we infer that no person can be brought to life again even by God Himself, the inference is illegitimate, it is a begging of the whole question. There is, therefore, no violation of physical truth, which merely says that this cannot be done *naturally*. It is not a physical truth that God might not raise up a dead man by supernatural power. And, indeed, if there be a God at all—not a God of Mr. Powell's making, but a personal Omnipotent God, who has created all things—the *a priori* argument that such a God could suspend the operation of the laws which He Himself had made—for instance, that he could, notwithstanding the general law to the contrary, raise a dead man to life,—is quite unanswerable. But inasmuch as Hume, Powell, and those who choose to deny the possibility of miracles, do not admit such a God, in arguing with them we cannot assume His existence. But neither must Mr. Powell assume that there is ~~no~~ such God, nor that miracles are impossible because they are out of the ordinary course, and beyond the powers of nature. We do not assume their possibility, nor can our adversaries prove their impossibility by any *a priori* argument. The question is one of pure evidence. If miracles have not been performed, the question as to their possibility can be of no practical use. A possible miracle will prove nothing. If, on the contrary, the existence of miracles can be established by irrefragable evidence, their possibility is demonstrated, because nothing can exist that is not possible. Mr. Powell will find it impossible to prevent reasonable men from inquiring into the evidence in favour of miracles. The very attempt, however, to stifle inquiry, is significant. If infidels did not feel that the evidence in favour of miracles is overwhelming, they would not outrage common sense, by asserting that they would not believe that five thousand men had eaten abundantly of five barley loaves and two fishes, which were brought to the place by one boy, the fragments alone filling twelve baskets, even though they had partaken of the repast, and had been witnesses of the entire occurrence. About such a fact, they could be no more deceived, if it really took place in their presence, than they could be deceived about their own existence; and it would be not only impiety, but sheer folly to reject the evidence of our senses, on account of *a priori* impossibilities in nature, regarding which no new discoveries

have been made, and which entirely escaped the penetration of Newton and of Davey.

But then we are told that our senses could never testify to us, with certainty, the existence of a miracle. We freely admit this, because a miracle is not immediately an object of sense. The senses can only testify the external appearances, the miracle is an inference of reason. The outward appearances of a miracle, are all natural objects of sense,—the whole question is as to the power by which these objects of sense have been produced—have they been produced by nature, or by a power which is superior to nature, and which rules over it? Thus, in the case of resurrection from the dead, take the recorded case of Lazarus, for instance,—his looks, his voice, his touch, his eating and drinking, were no less naturally objects of sense than if he had never died at all. Suppose persons, who had never heard of his death, to have mixed in society with him, surely their senses would have judged of him in precisely the same way as they would have judged of any other living man. What, then, does the knowledge of his death add? Simply that the life which this man enjoys has not been given him in the natural way—that he has been raised from the dead contrary to the general law of nature, which says that the dead rise not again *naturally*, but does not say that this cannot be done by *supernatural* power.

Powell admits that, in the case of an eye witness, there could remain no doubt as to the *truth* of the testimony of the senses, but he maintains that no matter what the fact might be, we could never *be certain* that it was really contrary to the laws of nature. The question of testimony, he maintains to be, in reality, but *adventitious* to the question of *miracles*, because, “supposing all doubt as to testimony were entirely removed, as in the case of an actual witness having the evidence of *his own senses* to an extraordinary and perhaps inexplicable fact, still the material enquiry would remain,—*is it a miracle?* It is here, in fact, that the essence of the question of credibility is centered—not in regard to the mere external, apparent, *event*, but to the *cause* of it—not to the mere impression on the senses of the witness, but to the nature of the source whence it is derived.* He then draws a distinction be-

* Order of Nature, p. 287.

tween an *extraordinary* fact which he admits is a proper matter for human testimony, and the *belief* in its being caused by *divine* interposition, which is a matter of *opinion*, and consequently not susceptible of support by testimony, and concludes thus; "We have observed that a *miracle* is a matter of opinion; and, according to the ordinary view, the precise point of *opinion* involved in the assertion of a miracle is, that the event in question, is a violation or suspension of the laws of nature."

According to this doctrine, supposing that all doubt as to the testimony regarding the facts, were removed, supposing that our Lord walked upon the waters, commanded the winds and the sea to obey Him, that He fed five thousand men on five barley loaves and two fishes, which a boy carried with him, the fragments of the repast filling twelve baskets, that not only at His own mere word, but at that of His Apostles also, during a period of thirty or forty years, disease fled away, the lame walked, the blind saw, and the cold grave rendered back its dead to life again; we should still not be able to infer with certainty, that the general laws of nature had, in any one instance, been suspended by the interference of superior power. We should suppose that all this had been effected by some occult energy of nature; all this might have been the result of unknown laws.

Now nothing can be more absurd than such a hypothesis as this. We do not know all the laws of nature, true. Recent discoveries have brought many wonderful things to light—the magnetic telegraph, for instance. Very true. We do not know what wonderful things may be brought to light hereafter. Granted. But though we do not know all that nature may do, we know very well, and so does the most unlearned person, who has come to the use of reason, a vast number of things which nature never will be able to do. We know that nature will never be found capable of bringing the dead to life again. We know that no discovery will ever be made by which five thousand men can be filled by five barley loaves and two fishes, the fragments alone filling twelve baskets. We know that nature cannot enable man by a mere word to change water into wine, to still the tempest and to heal the diseased. We know, in a word, that nature is not contradictory, but uniform; and not only the fact itself, but the certain knowledge of this

uniformity, and of the laws by which it is regulated, is absolutely necessary for individual security and for the very existence of society. If a man's dead wife might get tired of the grave and come back just as he brought home his new bride; if, when we expected our tea in the morning, the servant came to say that none could be made, as the fire, instead of boiling the kettle, congealed the water into a lump of ice; if the food which nourished yesterday poisoned to-day, it is clear that the human race must soon cease to exist, and the sooner the better.

In fact, no one, not even those who parade this trumpery about miracles proceeding from unknown laws, believes one word of it, for whenever they attempt an explanation of a recorded miracle, they always endeavour to reduce the fact within the boundary of the well-known laws of nature. For instance, none of them ever says, regarding the resurrection of Lazarus, granting the facts that he really died, that he was buried for four days, that he was already rotting in the tomb, that he was truly called back to life by the word of our Lord, the material inquiry still remains, "*is this a miracle?*" The italics are Mr. Powell's, and this is the very doctrine which he has the face to parade before the world, when speaking upon the abstract question regarding the nature of miracles. But when he speaks of the miracles recorded in the New Testament, he never attempts to apply this principle, but treats us to four or five theories, every one of which ignores the facts, in order to get rid of the miracles. The first of these, with which he favours us, is the rationalistic theory of Paulus, "who appears to have been throughout animated by the most sincere desire of vindicating the truth of the New Testament."* By Paulus and his disciples, who were all sincere friends and vindicators of Christianity,

"The cases of raising of the dead have been viewed as instances of '*suspended animation*.' In the case of Lazarus, they observe that, had not the body been thus preserved, decomposition must have commenced. These cases are compared with the recovery of St. Paul, after being left for dead.† Even the death of Jesus is thus regarded: it being undoubtedly quite out of the ordinary course that He should expire so soon as within a few hours, since

* Order of Nature, p. 320.

† Acts xiv. 29.

crucified persons were known to continue alive for several days ; and thus it is avowed that the revival may have commenced as soon as the body was laid in the cave. Medical testimony is adduced to show that a state of suspended animation often exhibits every symptom of death, the only actual proof of which is the commencement of decomposition, and nothing is more insisted on than that the body of Jesus 'saw no corruption.' One of these commentators maintains, that it was not the practice of the Romans in crucifixion to nail the feet, and would thus remove the difficulty of Christ's walking to Emmaus ; that He showed Thomas only His hands and His side, while the common belief arose from the desire to see the literal fulfilment of the prophecy. The rare appearances after the resurrection, it is pretended, are accounted for by the necessity of keeping out of the way of the inveterate Jews. Hence also, (according to these views), even the ascension itself is represented as a final retreat from the world ; as a disappearance from the Apostles in a cloud which enveloped the top of the mountain ; Jesus having gone apart, (διαστῆναι, Luke xxiv. 57), which corresponds to *πορευομενον* (Acts i. 10.) not 'going up,' but going away ; while the general expressions (*ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν* and *ἀνεφέρετο*), 'carried up into heaven,' being indefinite, it is contended do not necessarily imply the literal bodily ascent familiar to received belief and pictorial representation." *

Such is one of the theories (*risum teneatis, amici?*) which originated in the sincere wish to elucidate and vindicate the sacred narrative, and the perfecter of which "presented himself as the champion of Christianity," who defended "its records, especially the miraculous portion of them," against the formidable attacks made upon them in the *Wolfenbützel Fragments*.† Well might Christianity cry out, Save me from my friends. If Christ did not really die and rise again from the dead, Christianity is a base imposture. "For I delivered unto you," says St. Paul,‡ "first of all, which I also received ; how that Christ died for our our sins, according to the scriptures : and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures. . . . Now if Christ be preached that he rose again from the dead, how do some among you say, that there is no resurrection of the dead ? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not risen again. And if Christ be not risen again, then is

* Order of Nature, p. 328-30.

† Ibid. p. 320-33.

‡ 1 Corinthians, xv.

our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have given testimony against God, that he hath raised up Christ, whom he hath not raised up, if the dead rise not again.”

The mythic theory of Strauss (another sincere Christian champion) is next brought forward. Powell admits that it is entirely opposed to the naturalistic theory of Paulus, yet both arrive at the same conclusion, which is the rejection of all miraculous and supernatural events. Paulus, he says,* regarded “the evangelical narrative as historical, but explained its miraculous events by natural causes.” Strauss, on the contrary, “represents the narratives as intrinsically, and designedly fictitious, and as a mythical (that is a lying) invention for exalting the Messianic character.” This description of the theory of Strauss, is true enough, but what he says about that of Paulus, is evidently and designedly false.

With regard to our Lord’s resurrection, for instance, Strauss says that the death of their master having put an end to the temporal hopes of His followers, in the revolution of their feelings, their bewildered and excited minds created the myth, or to speak plainly the lie, of the resurrection and ascension, which they forthwith declared boldly, and made the basis of the new doctrine. Powell thinks this hypothesis when applied to the Gospel narrative in detail, however plausible in some instances, yet as a whole, overstrained and improbable. However, he thinks its suggestions open to reasonable consideration, especially as regards the conversion of water into wine, the multiplication of the loaves, the walking on the sea, the Incarnation, the Ascension, and other trifles which may be taken in a purely doctrinal or spiritual sense,—that is, the narration of these events may be regarded exactly in the same light as one of *Æsop’s* fables. †

The author details at length the subjective view of Feurbach, the psychological view of Ewald, the doctrinal view of Neander, and every view but the true view. Feurbach reduces all religious doctrine, including the existence of God, to a mere chimera of the brain. Of

* *Order of Nature*, p. 334.

† *Ibid*, p. 345, et seq.

Ewald's meaning, Powell is not so certain, but "he can collect enough to perceive a general acknowledgment on his part, that some broader principle ought fairly to be resorted to than the narrow, and (as we may consider it at the present day) generally renounced notion of real violations of the order of nature."* The doctrinal view, not of Neander, who admits miracles, but as improved by Powell, agrees with the other in denying the objective reality of all the supernatural events related in scripture, and in reducing them either to chimeras of the brain, or to instructive fables. Surely the most fastidious Christian will find in this large and new assortment of religious wares, something that will suit him. Powell might put over his shop—

Venditur hic Narcoticum
Emeticum Physicum Physicum
Et omne quod exit in um
Præter Remedium.

Catholics may well thank God that they have a Church when they see the Christain faith reduced to such monstrous absurdities. Such things are the natural result of the Protestant principle, as Mr. Powell truly declares in the following language. "When the inviolable sanctity of the claims so long maintained to their unlimited extent by the ancient Church, had been once invaded by the unsparing hand of Protestant criticism, and the plea of reason and free inquiry once recognized, it must be allowed that if one school of Protestantism should have adopted a bolder line of inquiry, or followed it out to a more ambitious extent, it is clearly not so much in principle as in the degree, the mode, the tone, of their speculations, that they have subjected themselves to the censures of the more literal interpreters."† We have dwelt at some length on the newest fashions of Protestantism, both to show to what lengths the principle of private judgment may be pushed, and also to exhibit the transparent insincerity of the pretence that, even if we were sure of the facts, we could never know that any occurrence was really contrary to the established course of nature, and above its

* Order of Nature, p. 363.

* Ibid. p. 310.

power. Even in the madness of novelty, and of speculation, no one has ever attempted to explain miracles by the application of this theory.

Powell objects to miracles being decisive proofs of doctrine, that many of the Jews who saw and admitted the miracles of our Lord, did not believe in Him; that those who were predisposed in His favour received Him, whilst those who were differently predisposed, rejected Him, and consequently that the works had nothing to do with the matter. Our Lord Himself thought quite otherwise, although Powell has the assurance to affirm that He scarcely ever appealed to His miracles as proofs of His mission. If he were as familiar with the New Testament as with the order of Nature, he could scarcely assert this. When John, hearing of the works of our Lord, sent to Him to know if He were the Messiah, He replied, Go and tell John what you have seen and *heard*; the blind see, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the dead rise again. (Matt. xi.)—But I have a greater testimony than that of John, for the works which the Father hath given me to perfect, the works themselves which I do (alluding to the miracle which He had just performed on the sabbath, and which occasioned this discourse) give testimony of me. (John v. 36.) That by works, he means miracles, is clear from John vii, 21, 23, where He says, *one work* I have done and you all wonder, and He then justifies Himself for healing on the sabbath, because it was lawful to circumcise on that day. Again He admonishes the Jews—"Otherwise believe for the very work's sake." (John xiv. 12).—Finally, not to multiply quotations, He declares: "If I had not done among them the works which no other man hath done, they would not have sin." (xv. 24). It is therefore clear that the mission and doctrine of our Lord, required to be supported by miracles. When a man sees a miracle, he cannot deny the evidence of his senses. He must admit it. But if the doctrine which it confirms be very distasteful to him, he may reject it. With regard to some miracles, he might try to persuade himself that they had been wrought by the power of the devil, and even when he could not do this, he might consider the sacrifices which the new faith required of him too great, and might prefer present to future happiness. Nothing could exceed the repugnance of the Jews to receive a poor humble man as their great and long-expected Messiah; those who re-

ceived Him surrendered their strongest and most cherished predilections to the evidence of His miracles; those who rejected Him, obstinately and sinfully adhered to their prejudices in spite of the clearest evidence. After the resurrection of Lazarus, the chief priests and Pharisees gathered a council and said: What do we, for this man worketh many miracles. If we let him alone so, all men will believe in him: and the Romans will come and take away our place and nation. (John xi.) They here acknowledge the irresistible force of His miracles, but prefer their temporal advantages to receiving and believing in the poor humble Jesus.

Video meliora proboque,
Deteriora sequor.

It is not necessary to discuss the question raised by Hume regarding the *certainty* derived from human *testimony*, especially concerning miracles, because the very groundwork of his argument,—that nothing is to be believed which is contrary to experience,—is rejected by Mr. Powell himself, (*Unity of Worlds*, p. 290) and we have already shown that we cannot arrive at the knowledge of any physical law by experience alone. Moreover, it is not the *miracle*, properly speaking, which is the object of human testimony, but the external phenomenon, which can be testified with as much certainty as the victories of Julius Cæsar, or the existence of the trade winds. In fact, if there were degrees in certainty, the belief in the miracles of our Lord and of His Apostles, would be much stronger than that which we have regarding Cæsar's victories, or the existence of the trade winds, because the motives are far stronger in the former case than in the latter. In the case of miracles, we have the testimony of persons, great numbers of whom were most reluctant witnesses, because the *truth* of the miracles forced both Jews and Gentiles to abandon their most inveterate prejudices, to adopt an austere faith, to submit in patience from the very first, to the opprobrium of men, to the loss of their property and even of their lives. We do not require the aid of Scripture to prove the truth of our Lord's death, resurrection, and ascension, on which facts the whole Christian revelation rests. The undoubted facts with which they are connected, the propagation of the Christian faith, of which they form the very essence, in the very

place and at the very time when they are said to have occurred, and the heroic constancy with which the witnesses of those facts suffered and died to attest their truth, are arguments so plain, and so convincing, as to come home to the understanding of the most illiterate peasant, and to defy the attacks of the most refined sophistry.

The objection to human testimony is founded on a real or assumed ignorance of moral impossibilities. It is physically possible that every adult in London should turn out naked on the streets some cold winter's morning, and yet we are quite as sure that they will not do so as that the sun will rise to-morrow morning. It is just as impossible that great numbers of persons should continue to suffer during a whole age, and that they should finally shed their blood to prove that they had seen with their own eyes that which they had never seen.*

We entirely agree with Mr. Powell that Protestants generally, neither have nor can have, any reasonable grounds for their Christian belief. How could illiterate persons—vast numbers of whom cannot even read, enter into the critical arguments regarding the genuineness even of the Gospels alone, the integrity of the text, and its inspiration? The latter point would puzzle Archbishop Whateley himself, and though he has written a book on Christian evidences, and lectured very flip-pantly on the subject, he neither has, nor ever will prove the inspiration even of the New Testament. He says the matter is quite easy, but he is only able to cite one instance in which a comparatively uneducated person had learned something of Christian evidence. We suppose he remembers the old saw, that one swallow does not make a summer. Granting this one case, what becomes of all the others, who, as Mr. Powell truly observes, have no better reason for their Christian faith than that they have heard it from the parson, or read it in the Bible, without having a single reason for believing in the inspiration of either the one or the other? Surely this is not reasonable faith, but the mere prejudice of education. If there be one thing more evident than another in Christianity, it is this, that Christ, who destined His religion for

* On the subject of testimony, see Dr. Murray's masterly dissertation in the *Irish Annual Miscellany*, vol. 2, chap. 6.

the poor and illiterate, as well as for the learned, never required each man to begin by proving the genuineness and inspiration of his Bible, and then to take his faith out of it. If so, He should at least miraculously teach the uneducated to read. As Archbishop Whateley thinks it so easy a matter to make out the evidence of Christianity, and truth of its doctrines, we beg to cite the following passage from Dr. Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophecy*, sect. 4.

"Since there are so many copies (of Scripture) with infinite variations of reading; since a various inter-punctuation, a parenthesis, a letter, an accent, may much alter the sense; since some places have divers literal senses, many have spiritual, mystical, and allegorical meanings; since there are so many tropes, metonymies, ironies, hyperboles, proprieties and improprieties of language, whose understanding depends on such circumstances that it is almost impossible to know the proper interpretation; . . . since there are some mysteries which, at the best advantage of expression, are not easy to be apprehended, and whose explication, by reason of our imperfection, must needs be dark, and sometimes unintelligible; and lastly, since those ordinary means of expounding Scripture, as teaching the originals, conference of places, parity of reason, analogy of faith, are all dubious, uncertain, and very fallible, he that is the wisest, and by consequence the likeliest to expound truest, in all probability of reason, will be very far from confidence, because every one of these, and many more, are like so many degrees of improbability and uncertainty, all depressing our certainty of finding out truth in such mysteries, and amidst so many difficulties."

Another point in which we quite agree with Mr. Powell is the light in which Protestants regard miracles, and the arbitrary period at which they summarily put an end to them. He says that "the great mass of professing believers (Protestants, of course,) are guided in their reception of Christianity, not by evidential arguments, but simply either by the prepossessions of early education and received opinion, or by what is believed to be the influences of Divine Grace:—miracles are admitted as a *part* of the Gospel, not as the *antecedent* or preliminary *proof* of it."* He then declares that "even more reasoning Protestant Christians" reject miracles, however positively asserted or firmly believed in their day, simply

* Order of Nature, 436.

because they had no connection with a religious revelation, and that the vast majority of believers receive the miracles in consequence of the assumed inspiration, not as the proof of it. Hence they arbitrarily limit omnipotent power, and declare all subsequent miracles antecedently incredible. Dodwell maintains miracles till the conversion of Constantine, (A.D. 312.) after the last day of which year they were no longer credible. Locke says we must either not go beyond the Apostles, or not stop at Constantine. Whiston extended the period to the end of the fourth, and Waterland to the fifth century. In order to get rid of the miracles recorded in Ecclesiastical history, these authors *necessarily* have recourse to *rationalising* grounds of criticism, which they often apply with no sparing hand.* “This summary rejection,” (continues Mr. Powell,) of “the appeal to miracles in the early Church—which even the historian of ‘the Decline and Fall’ seems disposed to admit as influencing the convictions of the converts—tends directly to set aside the argument commonly so much dwelt upon, of the *necessity* of miracles for the propagation of the Gospel.” Yet in fact those speculations of the Rationalistic School, which create so much offence in the minds of orthodox Protestants, proceed on *no other principles* than those which dictate their own critical rejection of the ecclesiastical miracles, and vindicate the disposition to regard them as mythical inventions on the one hand, or exaggerated versions of extraordinary natural events on the other.” After showing that Protestants reject ecclesiastical miracles by the very same arguments by which the Rationalists and Mythists reject the miracles of Christ and His Apostles, the author concludes thus: “Such varied and contradictory views of the Ecclesiastical miracles evince only the perplexity in which the whole question is unavoidably involved—unless taken on far more comprehensive principles, whether on one side or the other, than those most are willing to adopt.”†

What the author says in these passages is so plain that we are astonished to find intelligent Protestants who still obstinately resist its evidence. We at once admit that the Scripture miracles are not only evidences of the truth of Christianity, but also objects of faith. But in the two cases

* Order of Nature, p. 414.

† Ibid. 416-421.

they are regarded in entirely different aspects. They are objects of faith because they form a part of divine revelation; and in order that they may be thus regarded, the divinity of the Christian religion must be already established. As arguments addressed to the unbeliever, they must be rigidly demonstrated, and in this point of view, whatever tests are justly applied to subsequent miracles, are clearly applicable to the miracles of the Gospel. It is strange that even acute reasoners should still be misled by the argument that the Gospel miracles should be admitted because they were necessary to accredit a new revelation, whilst ecclesiastical miracles should be rejected because they are not the accompaniments of a new revelation. Surely it may be replied, that Christianity, which was destined for all mankind, still requires miracles to propagate it in those vast nations where it is still unknown. But in truth the whole argument is a *petitio principii*. Miracles are only to be admitted as the accompaniments of a new revelation. Pray where is this important truth revealed, and is it not just invented to get rid of the miracles of the Catholic Church? Our Lord declared that those who believed in Him should work miracles, without making any limitation as to time, or to persons. Then, when He raised Lazarus from the dead, was the belief of the spectators influenced in the slightest degree by the consideration that Christ came to announce a new revelation? If we need not investigate alleged miraculous facts, except when they are accompanied by a new revelation, of course we need not investigate them when they are accompanied by a false revelation. Now the Jews regarded our Lord's claims to be the Messiah as manifestly false, and His assumption of the title of Son of God, as clearly blasphemous. Certainly those who believed in our Lord's miracles were in no way influenced by the consideration that He came to announce a new revelation. On the contrary, the fact that He came to put an end to the Mosaic dispensations, prejudiced the Jews strongly against His miracles.

Miracles are no doubt necessary to accredit a new revelation; but to say that God may not work them on any other occasion, to propagate that same revelation, or to glorify that Church, to sanctify which He died, with which He remains all days, is the very excess of temerity. We

are not God's counsellors, His arm is not shortened, nor is His mercy limited to our age, or to our country. The invisible, supernatural grace and power which has sustained Christ's Church amid the trials and storms of eighteen centuries, have occasionally manifested themselves in supernatural works. Those *visible* miracles were no doubt most frequent in the beginning, when the Pagan world had no conception of the supernatural; but they were continued at rarer intervals, and they will never cease so long as the Church exists. The Church is not a human but a divine institution, and that divinity must occasionally burst forth in visible wonders, manifesting to a cold and incredulous world the supernatural life which animates the immaculate spouse of Jesus Christ. We do not mean to insinuate that miracles should be admitted except on the clearest and most unimpeachable evidence. We only affirm that as it is impious to reject miracles merely because they are violations of the order of nature, so also is it the excess of temerity to pronounce beforehand, that God will never work another miracle. "Though we may be certain that God will never reverse the course of nature, but for important ends, (the course of nature being the plan of government laid down by Himself,) Infinite Wisdom may see ends highly worthy of a miraculous interposition, the importance of *which may lie hid from our shallow comprehension*. Were, therefore, the miracles, about the credibility of which we now dispute, events brought about by invisible agency, though our being able to discover an important end served by a miracle would be no weak additional motive to our believing it, yet our *not* being able to discover any such end *would be no motive to induce us to reject it*, if the testimony produced to confirm it be unexceptionable.*

* Douglas, quoted by Dr. Newman. Essay, on Ecclesiastical Miracles, p. xx.

- ART. VI.—1. *Egypt's Place in Universal History; an Historical Investigation in four books.* By C. C. J. Baron Bunsen. Translated from the German by Charles H. Cottrell, Esq. 8vo., vols. I. II. London: Longman and Co., 1848-59.
2. *Ägyptiens Stelle in der Welt-geschichte. Geschichtliche Untersuchung in fünf Büchern.* Von C. C. J. Bunsen, 8vo., vols. I.—V. Hamburg, 1844-57.
3. *The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records stated anew, with special Reference to the Doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times; in Eight Lectures, delivered in the Oxford University Pulpit, at the Bampton Lecture for 1859.* By George Rawlinson, M. A. 8vo. London: John Murray, 1859.
4. *The History of Herodotus.* A new English Version, with copious Notes, and Appendices, illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus, from the most recent Sources of Information. By George Rawlinson, M. A. 8vo. Four volumes, with Maps, and Illustrations. Vols. I.—III. London: John Murray, 1858-9.
5. *The Encyclopædia Britannica.* Eighth Edition. Article *Egypt*. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1855.
6. *Philosophical Transactions*, 1855, 1858.—Account of some recent Researches near Cairo, undertaken with the View of throwing Light upon the Geological History of the Alluvial Land of Egypt. London: 1855, 1858.
7. *Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion.* By His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman. Second Edition. London: Dolman, 1842.

THE task which Baron Bunsen proposes to himself, to determine with precision "Egypt's place in Universal History," is unquestionably the most interesting problem in modern historical science. It is not alone that the authentic historical monuments of this mysterious kingdom far surpass in antiquity those of all the other nations of the gentile world: it is not merely that they bear in all their details, a stamp of genuineness which not even the most sceptical can dare to question, and exhibit if not a continuous, at least a connected, series, reaching up to a period in which the annals of other nations are either a hopeless blank or a maze of absurd and inextricable fable. The primitive records of Egypt differ from those of all

the other gentile nations in this also ;—that they alone offer as guarantees, not only of their authenticity, but also of their more remote origin, visible points of contact with the very earliest relics of the history of other races ; and that they derive, as it were, an antecedent confirmation from the records and traditions even of nations whose historical origin is confessedly long posterior to their own. The vaunted annals of the Babylonian, of the Chinese, and even of the Indian Empire, are suspicious from their very isolation. The antiquities of Egypt draw support and illustration from the earliest authentic traditions of Greece, no less than from the written testimonies of the Jewish legislator and historian.

And hence it is that, although the credulous vanity of almost every nation had invented or received a scheme of national history stretching back into the most remote antiquity, yet each of these schemes has in turn crumbled to pieces before the touch of modern scientific criticism. The boasted antiquity of the Chinese and Indian records, as well as of their pretended astronomical observations, has long been discarded as an empty fable. For a time, in the infancy of the science of archæology, and before the alleged observations had been submitted to a critical investigation, Chinese and Indian antiquities furnished material for many a grave impeachment of the Bible chronology. But it is needless to say that in this, as in all other studies, the supposed argument against revelation has, in the progress of the science, been converted into a fresh evidence of its truth.

The time has only now come when the archæology of Egypt is to pass through a similar phase. For although the early Egyptian history differs from that of all the other ancient nations in possessing monuments the genuineness and antiquity of which have never been called into question ; nevertheless, until a comparatively recent period, these monuments, considered as national records, were almost as completely devoid of significance as the stone circles of northern Europe, or the earth-mounds of Central America. Even after their real importance was ascertained, the process of investigating them, for many years, was little better than conjecture ; and perhaps the results which have eventually been obtained, ought to be regarded as fruits of intuition rather than of study. But the revolution, however effected, has been signal and complete.

One brilliant thought, by recovering the long-lost key of the hieroglyphic character, in a moment transferred the monuments of Egypt from the region of mystery or marvel to the world of real life. Science, ever active and ever vigilant, was not slow to claim them as her legitimate possession. The key, once discovered, has been used with ingenuity, with industry, and with perseverance. The effort has not been without its conflicts and its failures; but it has, nevertheless, been energetically sustained: and although much yet remains to be accomplished, substantial success can no longer be regarded as doubtful. The monuments of Egypt have taken their place, the more secure from the very ordeal through which they have passed, among the authentic materials of history.

The ancient history of Egypt, accordingly, comes to be re-written, or at least re-examined, in the new light thus shed upon its earliest period. It may well be doubted whether sufficient progress has yet been made in the examination of the many hieroglyphical records which are known to exist, and even whether the laws for the interpretation of the hieroglyphic character and of the ancient Egyptian language written therein, are as yet established with sufficient certainty, to supply such a body of historical materials as may be used with fully satisfactory results. But, whether rashly or otherwise, the work has been begun; and, if Baron Bunsen's volumes could be regarded as representing the feeling of the great body of Egyptologists, it might seem as if, in the light of the hieroglyphical records, they considered themselves in a position to adjust the history and chronology of the Old, the Middle, and the New Empire of Egypt, with the same cool security with which they would approach a discussion on the written records of Greece and Rome, or even of many of the early mediæval kingdoms.

Other Egyptologists, it is true, have pursued a less ambitious course, confining themselves, in the first instance, mainly to the work of collecting, deciphering, interpreting, and publishing, those of the ancient Egyptian remains, whether monuments or papyri, which partake of the historical character; in a word, of defining accurately what are the real materials of Egyptian history; of giving to them an authentic and intelligible form; and of placing them within the reach of those who, when a sufficient body of historical data shall have been

brought together, may be prepared to undertake the labour of investigating the full bearing of the new facts which they may reveal on the various problems, whether of Egyptian, or of general history. Such in the main has been the course followed by Brugsch and Lepsius in Germany, by Rosellini in Italy, by de Rongè in France, and by Hincks, Birch, Poole, and others, in England. Much had been done in the publication of the monuments through the munificence of the several governments of Europe, beginning with the great work which embodied the results of the French expedition. But the publication and interpretation of the almost equally important historical papyri, has been for the most part, the work of private enterprise, and the merit of it may be mainly ascribed to a single individual—the celebrated Lepsius. To him the Egyptian studies are indebted, not only for the great light which his own individual eminence as a master of the hieroglyphical language has thrown upon the history and antiquities of Egypt, but perhaps even more for the wonderful facilities which his publications have given to other adepts in the science, for proving, comparing, and criticising the results obtained, whether by his own interpretations of the monuments which he has published, or by those of the other scholars who have been engaged in the same pursuit. In truth, it is to the collision or interchange of views thus rendered possible, that we may ascribe the rapid progress of this curious and interesting study. It has been conducted, as it were, in a public, and almost an international school. The freedom with which each system of interpretation, and even each individual interpretation in detail, has been criticised and canvassed by the scholars of the several countries, has been a safeguard against fanciful and arbitrary theories, which could never have been obtained within the limits of any single school, however enlightened. We are far from thinking that, even as yet, that full and undoubting security of interpretation has been reached to which the enthusiasts of the science have laid claim. But, unquestionably, enough has been done in very many cases, to place it within the power of the student of the hieroglyphical language to follow, without reasonable fear of error, not merely the broad outline of facts and circumstances, but even the leading peculiarities of thought, and the general forms of structure and expression.

Nevertheless, we are strongly of opinion that, even still, the work is but in the first stage of its progress. We think that those students have done wisely who have directed their attention mainly to the collection and arrangement of the materials for the study. Many leading facts, it is true, which lie upon the very surface, have been brought to light by the hieroglyphical studies, in a way which it is impossible to gainsay or to misapprehend. These, and all similar results, have fallen naturally into their place in the general scheme of the history. Many of the coincidences with the narratives of the ancient historians, sacred and profane, which the hieroglyphical records have supplied, are of the clearest and most conclusive character; and the admirable translation of Herodotus, now on the eve of completion, which is named at the head of this article, owes most of its attraction, as well as of its great value, to the frequent and judicious use of the hieroglyphical records in the notes and appendixes which illustrate it. In like manner, Mr. Stuart Poole's article, EGYPT, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, is a complete re-casting of the materials of Egyptian history. Part, too, of the task which Baron Bunsen has undertaken, consists in discussing and appraising the several new and historical materials which hieroglyphical science has brought to light, an undertaking for which his great learning, and his practised faculty of criticism and research, have eminently fitted him. The first volume of *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, is as well a repertory of materials for the solution of the problem, as a resumé of the results of the latest researches of those who have devoted themselves to the study. As regards the latter, it is true, and indeed to some extent, also the former, the work is very deeply tinged with the writer's own peculiar views of the Egyptian question; but as a whole, we know no single work in which so comprehensive, and at the same time, so clear and compendious an account of the true sources of Egyptian history, such as they now are, can be obtained.

But, we regret to say, that here our praise of the Baron's work must end. As a collection of materials, it is extremely valuable; as a guide in the search for further materials of the study, it leaves little to be desired; as a simple, lucid, and orderly exposition of the hieroglyphical system, and a judicious recapitulation of the most reliable

results of the modern researches into the Old Egyptian grammar and vocabulary, it is all that might be expected from the well-known industry, learning, and sagacity, of the distinguished author. But as an actual contribution to the solution of the problem of early Egyptian history, we must declare it to be, in our judgment, a complete and signal failure,—more signal for the very pretensions with which it is put forth, and for the bold, dogmatical, and we may almost say, reckless, tone which uniformly pervades it.

Very different is the treatment of the subject by the learned editors of the new *Herodotus* in those portions of the work (the Second and Third Books) which relate to the history of Egypt. We are not acquainted, in any language, with so interesting a combination of ancient and modern learning, as this new translation exhibits. It is, as it were, a calling up once again of the Father of History, and a confronting of him, in criticism or in confirmation, with the monuments which he himself describes; and there is a calm and earnest tone both in the statements and in the speculations founded upon them, which contrasts most pleasingly with the rash and arbitrary, but yet most confident, assertions of the German scholar. The names, indeed, of Wilkinson and H. Rawlinson, are a guarantee for the learning and research which is exhibited in the notes; and Mr. Rawlinson, both in the *Herodotus*, and in those portions of the Bampton Lecture (although it is otherwise sufficiently commonplace) which regard the difficulties against revelation derived from Egyptian history, has proved himself not unworthy to be associated in the task even with such masters of the subject. We shall have occasion to refer more particularly to both these editors hereafter, in more than one matter of detail.

The subject of Egyptian history, even when considered solely in its relation to Sacred history, is much too vast to be considered in detail in a single article; but the simultaneous appearance of the various works enumerated at the commencement of our article, evince such an interest in the study, and such activity on the part of those who are engaged in it, that we think it necessary to bring it under the notice of our readers. The great space to which one of our earlier articles has extended, compels us for the present, to confine ourselves to a summary view of those sources of ancient Egyptian history which have been

recently discovered or at least brought into notice, and to a few of the more important points of detail suggested by the new discoveries, as well as to the inferences which have been drawn from them regarding the credibility of the scriptural narrative.

Up to the time of the great hieroglyphical discoveries, the sources of Egyptian history were sufficiently scanty. The modern discoveries may be more properly described as an illustration or supplement of the existing sources, than as an independent source of history. Many names, it is true, and a few facts or allusions to facts, have been recovered by the aid of the hieroglyphical remains; but they supply no connected history, and but few details regarding the isolated facts or personages which they reveal. Even Baron Bunsen, whose estimate of their importance will not be suspected as below the truth, admits that the monumental inscriptions contribute little to our historical knowledge. "There are but few words," he confesses, "in each line, and what is worse, but little is said in many lines. The inscriptions were *not intended to convey any historical information*. They consist of panegyrics on the king and praises of the gods, to each of whom all imaginable titles are given. Historical facts are thrown aside as something paltry, casual, and incidental, by the side of such pompous phraseology as 'Lords of the World,' 'conquerors of the North,' 'Tamers of the South,' 'Destroyers of all the unclean and their enemies.' " (III. 101.) It is true that the case of the Papyri is different. They are not by any means so meagre. But even from these little connected information has been gleaned. M. Bunsen confesses that "we have much to learn before we can interpret them to our satisfaction;" that it is "much easier to explain the monumental inscriptions, on account of the recurrence of the same phrases;" that, unsatisfactory as are those which have already been deciphered, we "know too much of them to venture to hope that we shall ever find anything different in kind;" (III. 102.) that "although the Egyptians possessed a history, it was not in their monuments;" and that the historical information which we glean from these monuments, "is not of more value than the meagre remains of historical tradition, which the epitomists have rescued from Manetho." (p. 103)

We have said thus much, in order to give an idea of the

general character, considered as historical materials, of those hieroglyphical records out of which the modern Egyptologists propose to reconstruct, and in great part to frame entirely in the new, the chronology and even the history of the ancient Egyptian Empire; and which, in cases of conflict, are held up as a conclusive authority, whereby to modify, and even altogether to supersede, the chronology and even the history of the Bible. Baron Bunsen's aim is no less ambitious than this. According to him we may hope, by the aid of these researches, "to establish the position of Egypt, as regards general history, in point of time; and certainly the adjustment of the chronology is indispensably requisite to an historical development. Its importance, indeed, in the most ancient histories cannot well be rated too highly. The nearer we approach to the primordial epochs of the history of our race, and the vaster those epochs become which it is our business to compute, the more important it is to establish that external relation, and the closer becomes the connection between time and history. In those silent primeval recesses, in those ages the deeds and exploits of which have long been buried in oblivion, and in which some prominent individuals even (the bright point of tradition, and humanly speaking, the lever of all history) manifest themselves at most only by the magic of their names and their influence upon their contemporaries and posterity—in those ages, we say, the adjustment of the chronology is decisive of the last questions which we have to ask in the history of the ancient world, and excludes at once many erroneous suppositions and conjectures. This is the case pre-eminently in the history of Egypt. We inquire whether she exercised material influence on the ceremonial of Jewish worship, on Jewish laws and customs; whether she did so upon Greece, and at what period; whether that influence was direct, or through the medium of other nations; whether the Egyptians can have derived the germs of their wisdom and civilisation from India; whether they are an Ethiopian or Asiatic race, from Meroe or Chaldea. These and other similar questions have been asked in the infancy of research, and still oftener in our own times, and have received very different answers. The restoration of Egyptian chronology may, perhaps, set some of them at rest, such as that of their Indian origin, by negativing them at once; and influence

materially the solution of them all. Finally, if in the primeval times of Egypt we approach the infancy of our race, and examine the traditions and theories propounded with respect to it—which consciously or unconsciously, voluntarily or involuntarily, all Christian writers have done—the exact definition of Egypt's place in history will acquire a vastly higher and more universal importance. If, after having ascertained the date of the foundation of the Egyptian empire, we inquire whether it tallies with Scripture tradition as to the creation of mankind, and whether it corroborates the chronological systems based upon it; what bearings it has upon the assumptions of the Greek and Latin churches; or (which will be the most sensible course) if we agree not to *dispute about a few thousand years* where objects so infinitely higher are concerned, how the result of our computations affects the *question of creation*; must we blink the point altogether, instead of answering it? Again, we inquire whether the study of Egyptian history would lead us to the conclusion that there was *one universal, or several partial and local floods*; and whether the most ancient traditions, those of Egypt especially, exhibit any indications of violent interruptions in the early stages of human advancement; and lastly, what light is thrown by our researches, on the great question of *the unity of the human race and its primordial epochs*."

The materials out of which this mighty scheme is to be constructed, are derived from two sources, native and foreign. The only native materials of primitive Egyptian history are the hieroglyphical inscriptions of the Monuments and Tablets, the Papyri, and the Fragments of the Egyptian historian, Manetho, a writer of the time of the Ptolemies. We shall briefly notice each of these three classes.

The great antiquity of the use of writing in Egypt is proved beyond all possibility of question. Baron Bunsen is of opinion that it is at least as old as the time of Menes. This opinion is at best only an inference, and an inference from data which are not absolutely established; but it is at least certain that among the hieroglyphic signs which Lepsius found on monuments which he regards as of the fourth dynasty, are those of the stylus and the inkstand; and the papyrus-roll figured among the hieroglyphics of the twelfth dynasty. Nor can it be doubted that the

Egyptians, from a very early period, possessed sacred books, enumerated by S. Clement of Alexandria,* the titles of which are 'the Books of the Chanter,' (ᾠδός) those of the 'Horoscopus,' (ὥροσκοπος) of the 'Hierogrammatist,' (ιερογραμματεὺς) of the 'Stolistes,' (στολιστής) and others of the same class. Besides these, and many similar books, which probably were more doctrinal and ceremonial than historical, there can be no doubt, from what Herodotus tells us, that there were also other and more directly historical records from an early period. "No Egyptian," he remarks (ii. 82.), "omits taking accurate note of extraordinary or striking events." Manetho observes, in agreement with all the Greek annalists, that the Egyptians possessed uninterrupted descriptions of their kings from Menes downwards. Herodotus (ii. 99. seqq.) was also acquainted with lists of kings kept by the priests, in which the events and monuments of each reign were recorded: from one of these they read to him the names of 330 kings, successors of Menes (ii. 100.) Diodorus enters more into detail as to the nature of these lists or annals of the priests, although his information, as we shall see, is less accurate. 'The priests,' he says in the introduction to that part of his work which treats of Egyptian History (i. 44.), 'had in their sacred books, transmitted from the olden time, and handed down by them to their successors in office, written descriptions of all their kings' (from the time of the fabulous monarchs, called heroes, to that of the Ptolemies). 'In these an account is given of every king—of his physical powers and disposition, and of the exploits of each in the order of time.' Artaxerxes in his expedition through the country, carried off these descriptions from the archives of the Temple; Bagoas, his lieutenant, afterwards restored them to the priests for a large sum of money. It was in these 'descriptions,' or at least in works compiled from them, that Theophrastus found his account of an emerald of immense size, which a king of Babylon had on some occasion sent with other objects of great value, as a present to a king of Egypt—probably Nechao."

But what may possibly have been the historical value of these and similar records as bearing upon

* Stromat. vi. p. 268.

primitive Egyptian history, we are, unfortunately, spared the necessity of considering. Not one of these ancient books, whether doctrinal or historical, has been preserved; unless perhaps we are to regard as such the papyri; to which we shall directly have occasion to refer. For all knowledge of their nature and contents we must depend entirely on the more recent historians and compilers—a circumstance, we need hardly say, which in great measure removes them, as independent original materials, out of the range of legitimate criticism, and brings their authority down to the level of that of the authors to whom we are indebted for the knowledge of them. Probably the most ancient materials of Egyptian history are the well-known inscribed monuments, called Stelæ—sepulchral tablets, with the dates of the king's reign under whom they were erected, several of which are deposited in the museums of Turin, Leyden, and Berlin. There is little real history, however, to be gleaned from such isolated fragments, even were not their age, as well as their signification, involved in the deepest obscurity and uncertainty.

Much more importance has been attached to two monumental records, derived from the two most ancient metropolitan cities of Egypt, Thebes and Abydos. The first of these, which is commonly called the Royal Series of Karnak, is from the ruin of the Palace of Thebes, erected by Tuthmosis III. It was discovered in a chamber of this most interesting ruin, and is now in one of the halls of the Imperial Library at Paris. The original site is thus described by Baron Bunsen:

“Let us imagine a tolerably spacious chamber perfectly square, with one door not very large, in the centre of one of the sides. On entering, four rows of figures in calcareous sandstone, representing Kings in a sitting posture, one over the other, are seen upon the walls. The Kings are seated on thrones, the backs of which at a central point, exactly opposite to the door, touch one another. So that in each of the four rows one half of the figures have their faces turned to the left, the other half to the right. The rows in each subdivision contain eight figures with one or two exceptions, where the number is but seven; the first three figures of each subdivision are on the wall opposite the entrance, which has consequently in all six in each (entire) row—the other five (or four) are on the side wall contiguous to it on the right and left. In front at the end of each side wall, opposite to the sitting Kings,

stands—twice repeated—above and below—the figure, in larger proportions, of Tuthmosis III., the renowned fifth ruler of the 18th Dynasty, in the act of offering sacrifice. Each figure is precisely equal in height to two of the four rows, so that one of them is opposite to the two upper, the other to the two lower rows. Before him stand the tables of sacrifice with offerings, occupying sometimes more sometimes fewer panels of the rows of Kings. The result is that the rows contain on the left 31 ($8+8+7+8$), on the right 30 ($8+8+7+7$). A reference to the table at the end of this chapter will render this description more intelligible.

“Over the head of each King is his Royal Ring, with the customary imperial titles. Each is holding out his right hand to receive the offerings. Tuthmosis himself has in one hand the sign of life (the so-called key of the Nile,) with the other he offers to the sitting Kings the gifts which lie scattered before him on the table. All doubt as to the personages to whom the offerings are made is removed by an inscription appended to the right of the figure, in the following terms :

“the Royal offerings
to the Kings of the Upper and Lower country (Egypt).”—
vol. i. pp. 36-37.

The Tablet of Abydos is believed to be about a hundred and fifty years later than that of Thebes. Like its venerable companion, it has been removed from its original site, and now adorns the collection of the British Museum. M. Bunsen describes it minutely :

“The series of Kings of Abydos is sculptured in fine limestone on the wall of a chamber, now destroyed, within the Temple-palace built or restored by Rameses in that primeval royal city. The lower part, comprising the legs, of a Deity swathed in bandages is seated on a throne, holding with both hands a Kukuf sceptre. Lepsius has restored this as Osiris, who may be here considered as the principal Lord of the West, and the Pluto of the Hades of the deceased Kings. He is looking towards a double row of Royal Rings, 26 in number, of so many Egyptian Kings, who are represented seated under their Rings, swathed like Osiris, and wearing alternately the upper and lower portion of the Pschent, the sign of Lordship of Upper and Lower Egypt. Lepsius has restored the horizontal line of hieroglyphics, which was placed over their Rings as follows : *A libation to the Lords of the West, by the offerings of* (i. e. offered by) *their son, the King Rameses, in his abode.* (This inscription is directly connected with the vertical lines or columns underneath it, containing the names of the Kings.) The libation is offered ‘to’ (indicated by the zigzag line of water) each King successively ‘through’ or ‘from the offerings’ (i. e. a dual offering because there are two names in each vertical

line) 'of King Rameses.' Now, judging from the two Tablets at Karnak, where the same King is offering to the Deities 'Phtha' and 'Ra in all their names,' and where the Divinities are on the left, and the King with his offerings on the right of the picture, the King Rameses must have been on the right of this Tablet when it was complete. The two perpendicular lines of hieroglyphics on the left, as restored by Lepsius from an analogous inscription contain the speech of the Kings. They say: (*The speech of the Lords [L.] of the West to their son the creator and avenger, the Lord of the World, the Sun who conquers in truth, we ourselves elevate our arms to receive thy offerings and all other good and pure things in thy palace, we are renewed and perpetuated in the paintings of thy house, we beg to approach at thy side with thee, to rule it like the Solar gate of the heaven, where is the Sun for ever (?)*). Although therefore the votive inscription is entirely wanting above, and only the lowermost part of the two hieroglyphic columns before the King is preserved, both inscriptions nevertheless can be restored with such general accuracy, by means of the precisely similar one above referred to, as fully to establish the fact that the Tablet terminates with the upper of these two rows of Royal Rings. It must appear strange no doubt, that the array of persons who are doing homage to the Great King, in the two nearest compartments of the second row, begins with his own rings. But the very same representations occur in the Temple sculptures, and especially in those of this identical King Rameses. The earthly Sovereign is distinct from him who is one day to be enthroned under 'the Lords of the Lower World,' and therefore is sacrificing to him as a God, just as he might have done, in the Persian Mythology, to his Ized, or, in the Etrusco-Roman, to his Genius. The King receives from him in return thanks and the Divine blessing. A twofold representation of royalty both as an earthly and as a glorified king, seems also to occur on the sculptures of Persepolis. Darius and Xerxes appear in the former capacity—Cyrus, the founder of the Empire, as Ized. Here however one and the same King is delineated in both characters. Four-and-twenty Rings of this row still remain, so that in the two we have altogether 50."—vol. i. pp. 46-48.

These tablets have been a subject of much controversy among Egyptologists. Wilkinson is in doubt whether the Kings of the Karnak Series be Egyptian or Ethiopian. Cullimore is of opinion that the personages represented are, in part at least, not kings but viceroys. Hincks denies to the monument all claim to a historical character; and although Baron Bunsen, taking these tablets in connexion with the Dynasties of Manetho, upholds them as of the very highest authority, yet he frankly admits, not only that "such documents cannot compensate for the want of written history," but that "even chronology, the

external frame-work of history, cannot be elicited from them." (I. p. 32).

More might be expected, at first sight, from the Papyri. One class of these, the funereal papyri, may perhaps be regarded as the only existing representatives of the sacred books of the ancient Egyptians. They have generally been found in the mummy-cases, between the thighs, beneath the arms, or upon the stomach, or in the bend of the knees, of the mummy. A papyrus of this class would appear to have been regarded as a passport to happiness after death;* and some of those still preserved, are found to have been prepared as articles of commerce, blanks being left for the name and title of the deceased, to be filled up in each particular case as the demand arose. Baron Bunsen's account of these curious formularies is very meagre. A much more minute and satisfactory analysis will be found in the Article *Papyrus*, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* ;† but as none of these funeral papyri, however curious and valuable in illustrating the ancient religion of Egypt and even the social usages of the people, can be considered as materials for history in the sense contemplated by us, we shall not dwell upon them here.

The papyri, which belong more strictly to that class, are very few in number. Only two of these are described by Baron Bunsen.

The first is the so called Scythian Campaign of Ramesses the Great. It contains "a narrative of the expeditions and campaigns of the great Rameses, written not long after that conqueror's death. Several extracts, containing the names of the conquered nations—among whom are the Ir-hen—were published by Salvolini with other historical matter, transcribed, as it subsequently appeared, from papers stolen by him from his master. This Papyrus, with others on cognate subjects—the praises, for example, of Sesostris of the 12th Dynasty—were in 1839 purchased, on the recommendation of Lepsius, for the British Museum, and form one of the gems of that rich collection. The zealous curators of that institution have already published these Records in the most correct and critical

* See a curious example in Dr. Hinck's "Catalogue of the Egyptian MSS., in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin." p. 31.

† Vol. xvii. 263.

form." If the reader, however, should expect from this papyrus, anything approaching to what in the modern sense is called history, he will be grievously disappointed. It consists almost entirely of encomiums of Rameses, inflated addresses to his soldiers, dialogues of Rameses with various deities, and other matter of the same rhetorical character, which, though highly curious and characteristic, is of little value as material for history. The Rameses Papyrus is not the only one of this class. Others, on the subject of some of the later Kings, are found in the Turin collection, though still unpublished. But of all these papyri Baron Bunsen is found to admit that, "owing to the backward state of the philological branch of Hieroglyphic study, our knowledge of this dialect is unfortunately not yet sufficiently advanced to admit of their translation. Such a result can only be attained by a variety of researches, systematically and methodically followed up. There seems to be no doubt, however, that they contained the praises of the more distinguished Kings, and in a poetical form. Hence, as formerly observed, we have here still *no History in the proper sense*. This is no proof, however, that those songs of the Priests in praise of their Kings were of a mythical nature. They celebrated historical, and perhaps reigning, sovereigns, and may have narrated events and exploits yet fresh in the recollection. They were the work of the most historical and most monarchical of nations, for there is still in existence the amulet of a contemporary private citizen, commemorating the conquests of one of these Kings, the father of the Great Rameses."

The second of the historical Papyri, is the celebrated Turin "Papyrus of the Kings." It had formed part of the Drovetti collection; but from its excessively mutilated and fragmentary condition, it was for a long time unnoticed. Its value was first observed by Champollion, by whom the fragments were partially arranged; but the merit of reducing all its parts into order and restoring the whole papyrus to a form of comparative completeness, is due to Dr. Seyffarth, who most ingeniously employed the microscope in the adjustment of the fragments, by observing and comparing the fibres of each, and thus placing all the parts in correct juxtaposition. The papyrus is arranged in twelve columns, each of which contains from 26 to 30 lines, each line generally containing the name of a king.

The number of kings who can be traced, is about 200; but it would appear from the number of missing fragments, that the lists originally embraced at least 250. The papyrus itself is supposed by Lepsius to date from the time of Rameses II. It does not contain the name of any king later than the eighteenth dynasty. The contents of the Series are thus summarily described:

"The list began (in the first volume of the fragments) with the Dynasties of the Gods. Six names are preserved—Seb (Chronus), Osiris, Seth (Typhon), Horus, Thoth, and Ma (Truth)—by the side of the 7th, in whose name Salvolini fancied he discovered the Hawk, Lepsius found the number 400 appended. According to him, 3140 years are ascribed to Ma, and to Thoth probably 3226. By the side of one of the Dynasties of Gods, or, as is more probable, at the conclusion of those of the Heroes or Manes (the provincial Dynasties prior to Mones), stands, according to Salvolini, the subjoined notice:

"'Sum total: 23 reigns, 5613 years,.....months, 28 days.'

"This shows clearly the arrangement of the Egyptian Royal Lists. They were divided into Dynasties—by the side of each King the length of reign was registered, and each Dynasty closed with the summing up of the Kings, and of their years of reign. The commencement of a new Dynasty, or a division in the same Dynasty is indicated by red characters.

"In the second column the names of Menes and Athotis are preceded by computations, which unfortunately we are unable to interpret. Thus in line 9 behind Horus we read, '13,420 years,' and then follows:

"'Kings up to Horus, 23,200 years,' (the decimals may have dropped out). Next to this come two mutilated data, where however the name of Menes can yet be recognized (lines 11, 12.)—the thirteenth row still exhibits that of Athotis, the son and successor of Menes, according to the Lists.

"Lepsius has arranged the remaining Rings of mortal Kings in three great masses, in the following manner:

First: for the Old Empire:

(a) before the 6th Dynasty (terminating with 3 Kings of the 5th)	34 Kings, in 10 frag.
---	-----------------------

(b) from the 6th up to the 12th, closing with the latter ...	20 Kings, in 6 frag.
--	----------------------

Making in all for the Old Empire	54 Kings, in 16 frag.
----------------------------------	-----------------------

<i>Secondly</i> : for the Middle Empire (Hyksos period)	65 Kings, in 6 frag.
--	----------------------

Altogether therefore, before the restoration of the Empire	119 Kings, in 22 frag."
---	-------------------------

vol. i. pp. 53-54.

We shall have occasion to revert to the chronological questions which arise out of this curious document. But the reader will not fail to be struck by this fact, that, whatever might be the historical value of this, or any similar monument, as a record of contemporaneous, or nearly contemporaneous events, the contents of the Royal Papyrus are in great part, (as in the dynasties of the gods and heroes), avowedly fabulous; and that even where, as in the earlier dynasties, they present a less evidently unreal appearance, their credibility must entirely depend upon questions of age, authorship, and authentic character, which it would now be a hopeless task to investigate with success.

There is another class of historical Papyri which Baron Bunsen does not include in this part of his enumeration of the Sources of Egyptian history—those which are known as the *Exodus Papyri*, and an account of which is published under that title* by the Rev. Dunbar Heath. If Mr. Heath's account of these papyri could be relied on as established satisfactorily, they would present many very curious coincidences with the Mosaic narrative of the Exodus. According to Mr. Heath's interpretation, these papyri tell of a people among whom was a leader named Moses, marching towards Palestine by the route of Tasa-carta, Megdol, and Zoar; of a contest at the place of a great water-flood; of an enslaved people of Aramæan origin, who were located about Talpanhes, being refused permission by the governor to celebrate their four-days' feast, at the beginning of the year; of a royal youth being carried off by a sudden and mysterious death, in consequence of which an order is immediately issued for their being permitted to depart in haste to celebrate their feast of passing the dead; and of miracles being performed in the palace of Lower Egypt.† Again, according to Mr. Heath, a person named Jamres is mentioned five times; Moses is named twice. We read of Balak, the son of Zippor, at a place called Huzoth; we also meet the name Hebrew, and as already mentioned the feast of "passing the dead." Such is Mr. Heath's reading of these curious papyri: but it is very doubtful whether these

* The *Exodus Papyri*, by Rev. D. J. Heath. London, 1855.

† *Exodus Papyri*, pp. 57-8.

translations can be relied on. Mr. Goodwin, in an Essay on the subject, in the Cambridge Essays, 1858, repeatedly differs from Mr. Heath, not merely as to points in the translation, but as to the entire bearing of the document, and even as to the subject itself; and we may add, in confirmation of what we have already said, Mr. Goodwin's deliberate avowal that, in the infancy of the art of interpreting the hieroglyphics, "with an incomplete knowledge of the syntax and a slender vocabulary, *translation is mere guesswork*, and the misconception of a single word or phrase, may completely confound the sense." *

Even Baron Bunsen himself, as we saw, admits, to a great extent, the incomplete and unsatisfactory character of these remains considered in themselves. But it is to the native Egyptian historian, Manetho of Sebennytus, that he looks for the explanation of all their difficulties, the filling up of all the gaps which they leave in the chronology, and the reconciliation of all their inconsistencies and contradiction. To this authority, he seems to defer with the most implicit confidence. In describing the personal qualities of Manetho, he speaks of him as "the most distinguished historian, sage, and scholar, of Egypt," (I. 56) and as "endowed with consummate wisdom" (p. 57); and, in reference to the authenticity and credibility of the remains now ascribed to him, he does not hesitate to say that "the numbers of Manetho have been transmitted to us quite as correctly as those of the Canon of Ptolemy." (p. 87).

We need not hesitate to describe this judgment as a most extravagant and unscientific exaggeration. In estimating the real value of Manetho's authority as to the facts or the chronology of primitive Egyptian history, there are several circumstances which Baron Bunsen either overlooks, or at least sets aside as unworthy of consideration.

In the first place, having flourished in the reign of Ptolemy Soter, about the middle of the fourth century before Christ, Manetho is separated from the events upon which we are asked to regard him as an authority *by fully 3000 years*; and it must be remembered, in addition, that the points for which his authority is chiefly relied on by Baron Bunsen, are dates, succession of dynasties, dura-

* Cambridge Essays, 1858; p. 229.

tion of reigns, and of epochs, and other chronological details, regarding which tradition, beyond certain very narrow limits, is utterly and hopelessly at fault.

Secondly, whatever might have been Manetho's authority, we do not possess his own work, nor even any regular or authentic summary of it. Manetho's Egyptian History *has long been lost*.

It is true that his lists of the dynasties were preserved by the so-called chronographers, Julius Africanus, George the Syncellus, and in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius. But in the first place, Africanus's transcript of Manetho's dynasties has only come to us at second-hand. *This work of Africanus also is lost*; and it is only through the Syncellus, a Byzantine writer of the ninth century, that we are acquainted even with so much of it as contains Manetho's lists of dynasties.

And again, as if to weaken still farther the authority even of this second-hand transcript, the lists of Manetho, as there found, differ materially in many particulars from the same lists as given in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, although the latter profess to be copied directly from the work of Manetho itself. And, indeed, even as early as the time of Josephus, important discrepancies existed between the various editions of Manetho's history which were then in circulation.

One might suppose that such an authority as this,—a witness so far removed in point of time from the period regarding which he wrote, so imperfectly and unsatisfactorily transmitted to us, and so deformed by discrepancies and contradictions even when transmitted, ought not to be received without suspicion, or lightly to be set above other recognised authorities. And yet, with Baron Bunsen, Manetho's authority is held to rank as decisive, even for such minute and inappreciable details as the length of a reign in one of these remote epochs, the order of succession among individuals or dynasties, and the exact duration of the dynasties themselves! With all the critical doubts and difficulties to which we have briefly alluded before him, he does not hesitate to accept Manetho as a voucher, not merely for a question of centuries or longer spaces, but even for small fractional periods of time; and coolly lays down that it may be "**HELD ESTABLISHED that Manetho assigned to the Egyptian Empire from Menes to the younger Nectanebo, a period of 3555 years!**"

•

Such are Baron Bunsen's views as to the native sources written and monumental of Egyptian history. Among the foreign writers, who have directly or indirectly treated the primeval history of Egypt, he relies chiefly, and indeed we may almost say exclusively, on Eratosthenes. It would be difficult to go beyond the glowing panegyric with which this author is introduced.

"Eratosthenes, next to Aristotle, the most illustrious among Greek men of learning, and as far superior to him in the extent of his knowledge, as inferior in grasp of intellect, was an African by birth, from the Greek colony of Cyrene. Strabo calls him and Callimachus the pride of that city—'for,' he adds, 'if there ever was a man who combined skill in the art of poetry and grammar—common to him and to Callimachus—with philosophy and general learning, Eratosthenes was that man.' He reduced to a system two sciences, both of which he found in their infancy, Geography and Chronology. His calculation of the size of the globe, when submitted to the stricter test of modern science, proved the most correct hitherto made. His adjustment of the leading points in Grecian history, on the basis of the Olympic era—upwards to the time of the Heraclidæ, and downwards to that of Alexander the Great—was and continued to be the groundwork of all the chronological researches of the old world. In geography he was the guide and authority of Strabo and Ptolemy—in chronology of Apollodorus and the later calculators. He was the founder of historical criticism for the primitive ages of Greece. Lastly, he ventured to doubt the historical truth of the Homeric legends. 'I will believe in it,' said he, 'when I have been shown the currier who made the wind-bags which Ulysses on his voyage homewards received from Æolus.'

"The extent and depth of his geographical researches, as known to us through Strabo, prove that his historical inquiries were not limited to the world of Hellas. But in this latter department he is more especially distinguished as the first and greatest critical investigator of Egyptian antiquity. His remark upon the tyrant Busiris, as recorded by Strabo, and the ridicule with which he treated the popular Greek legend concerning him and his human sacrifices, may here be cited as peculiarly characteristic: 'By Jupiter,' said he, 'there never was such a tyrant as Busiris—not even a King of that name.' In two other passages of still greater importance in their critical bearing on Egyptian history, though hitherto little appreciated, he elucidates the historical connection between the native tribes of South Africa and Asia towards India, and the Egyptians. 'The four principal races of South Africa,' he remarked according to Strabo, 'have not only a well-regulated monarchical constitution, but also stately temples and

royal palaces; the beams in their houses are arranged like those of the Egyptians.' In his description of the southern promontory of Arabia, at Babelmandeb, he says, 'here must have stood the pillars of Sesostria inscribed with Hieroglyphics.' This he follows up with a detail of the campaign of that conqueror in those parts, which we reserve for our illustration of his own era.

"Every notice therefore relative to Egypt, emanating from a man of such rare talent and extensive learning, is deserving of the highest respect. Besides which, we must also reflect that for the history of Egypt, above that of all other countries, every attainable material was at his disposal. Born in the 126th Olympiad, about 276 B. c., in the early part, consequently of the reign of Philadelphus, he succeeded, probably under Euergetes, to the honourable post of Director of the Alexandrian Library, which he filled up to the time of his death (in his 80th or 82nd year, in the 146th Olympiad).

"The very researches to which our attention is here directed, were undertaken by command of the King, consequently with every advantage that Royal patronage could procure for the investigation from the Egyptian Priests. They were more especially devoted to the 'so called Theban Kings.' This expression designates literally such as were of Theban origin. But the first of the series, Menes, was not of that race—he was the hereditary prince of This; on which account he and his successors were entitled Thinite, and as such are cited by Manetho. In the passage before us, however, the expression is 'so-called Theban Kings,' the true sense of which will become more apparent by reference to the general contents of the List."—pp. 119-21.

Indeed, so profound is the Baron's veneration for this prodigy of critical acumen and accurate research, that he does not scruple even to sacrifice his favourite Manetho to the greater glorification of his new idol. "Eratosthenes," he says, "corrected throughout, all the deficiencies and blunders which Manetho did not perceive to exist in the Egyptian method in respect to the continuous chronology. The records of the old Empire were in confusion; restorations had been made which contradicted each other. Eratosthenes discovered the only certain clue in the archives of Thebes, where a register was kept of every king, there recognised as such, and how long he reigned. By this means a coherent chronology could be framed, which is exactly what we require."* Will it be believed that the authority of the writer, thus unhesitatingly ac-

* III. 13-14.

cepted, is liable to the very same exceptions which every reasonable critic must hold to be fatal to the *prima facie* credibility of Manetho;—Eratosthenes being even more remote from the period regarding which he wrote, the original of his history being lost, and the contents being known to us only through the same second-hand and evidently faulty and corrupt compilation—that of George the Syncellus! Even Baron Bunsen himself confesses, that “in the original names, as well as in the Greek version, *numerous* more or less palpable errors of the text are observable,” which, he adds, “can excite but little surprise considering the remote epoch from which they are derived, and how utterly unintelligible they were to the copyists—coupled with the circumstance that we possess but two MSS., to one alone of which any real value attaches.” (I. 117.)

And yet, in the very same breath in which he makes this confession, Baron Bunsen has the incredible hardihood to ask his readers to believe that, on such an authority as this, “not only the number, succession, and for the most part the individual names, but also the whole period of one thousand and seventy-six years in thirty-eight reigns may be assumed beyond all reasonable doubt, as facts distinctly vouched for by Eratosthenes!”

We have been thus minute in describing the principal authorities on which M. Bunsen constructs his scheme of primeval Egyptian history, in order that the reader may be enabled to judge the better of the principles which the same author applies to the comparison of this scheme with the received Biblical history and chronology. The contrast is briefly stated by Mr. Rawlinson in his first Bampton Lecture.

“On the ground that Egypt has a continuous history, commencing more than 6000 years before the Christian era, we are required to reject the literal interpretation of the 6th, 7th and 8th chapters of Genesis, and to believe that the Flood was no more than a great catastrophe in Western Asia, which swept away the inhabitants of that region but left Egypt and the greater part of the world untouched. Ham, we are told, is not a person, but the symbolical representative of Egypt; and he is the elder brother, because Egyptian Hametism is older than Asiatic Semitism. The expression that Canaan is the son of Ham ‘must be interpreted geographically;’ it means, that the Canaanitic tribes which inhabited historical Canaan came from Egypt, where they had pre-

viously had their abode. Nimrod is said to have been begotten by Cush; but he was no more a Cushite by blood than Canaan was an Egyptian; he is called a Cushite, because the people represented by him came from the part of Africa called Cush or Ethiopia (which they had held as conquerors) back into Asia, and there established an empire. Again 'the family tree of Abraham is an historical representation of the great and lengthened migrations of the primitive Asiatic race of man, from the mountains of Armenia and Chaldæa, through Mesopotamia, to the north-east frontier of Egypt, as far as Amalek and Edom. It represents the connection between nations and their tribes, *not personal connection between father and son*, and records consequently epochs, *not real human pedigrees*.' The early Scriptures are devoid altogether of an historical chronology. When the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt is said to have been 430 years, of which one half, or 215 years, was from Abraham's going down into Egypt to Jacob's, the other from Jacob's going down to the Exodus, the number must be regarded as 'conventional and unhistorical;' as 'connected with the legendary genealogies of particular families;' as formed in fact artificially, by a doubling of the first period; which itself only 'represents the traditionary accounts of the primitive times of Canaan as embodied in a genealogy of the three patriarchs,' and 'cannot possibly be worthy of more confidence than the traditions with regard to the second period,' which are valueless. Of course the earlier lists of names and calculations of years are looked upon with still less favour. 'The Jewish tradition, in proportion as its antiquity is thrown back, bears on its face less of a chronological character,' so that 'no light is to be gleaned from it' for general purposes. Even in the comparatively recent times of David and Solomon, there is no coherent or reliable chronology, the round number 40 being still met with, which is taken to be an indubitable sign of arbitrary and artificial arrangement."—Rawlinson, pp. 17-19.

The reader may perhaps be curious to see the process by which M. Bunsen attempts to reconcile this arbitrary system of chronology with the nominal acceptance of the Biblical narrative, and the professed respect for the authority of the Bible. We must make room for a single specimen—that which regards the period of 230 years assigned in Exodus, xii. 40, for the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt.

"The second datum occurs—with reference to the Exodus—(Ex. xii. 40.) in the following parenthetical remark: 'Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years.'

"This statement may seem to originate in the same theory

which forms the foundation of the previous passage, so that the thirty years may be reckoned as the age of the migrating host, they being at the same time called the fifth generation. Or it may be said the latter is the historical, strictly chronological, the former the prophetic form, in which there is no definition of time. Upon either view it is plain that the two data taken literally do not agree, and that they are therefore not strictly chronological. In the first case we could not from the outset expect any strictly chronological date, for none such can be based upon a prophetic announcement. It is certainly very different with the second hypothesis. But in this case the fact of a broad discrepancy in the terms of the tradition as handed down from the remotest period precludes its adoption as the basis of any chronological system. The common text of the Septuagint inserts after 'Egypt' the words '*and in Canaan.*' We shall see in the sequel that according to the genealogies from Abram to Jacob, the earlier sojourn in Canaan is fixed at 215 years; this number, therefore, here clearly forms the basis of the computation, the period from the migration of Abram into Canaan to the Exodus having been considered as ranging itself under two equal divisions, one of which belongs to Canaan, the other to Egypt. But then it should have said—the children of Israel '*and their fathers,*' which is in fact the reading, both of the Alexandrian MS. of the Septuagint, and of the Samaritan version. But no such regular division can ever be historical. Consequently, both the Alexandrian and Samaritan addition must be considered as a license of conjectural criticism, and the preference given to the Hebrew Text. But 430 is exactly the double of the time from Abram's entrance into Canaan down to Jacob's journey into Egypt. The number, therefore, is itself conventional and unhistorical. For it were in our opinion as repugnant to any sound critical view of the passages to suppose that in early times such genealogical lists could have been so parcelled out, that the sum resulting from them should form precisely one half of the 430 historically transmitted years, as to assume the one period to have really been exactly the double of the other. There is no reason why any registers should have been so artificially adjusted, as that the series of years obtained should form precisely one half of the number historically established for the next period. On the contrary, we must consider it the more natural explanation of the passage, to adopt the number 215 as the more ancient. It represents the traditionary accounts of the primitive times of Canaan as embodied in a genealogy of the three patriarchs, which commenced with Abram's migration out of Mesopotamia, and ended with the settlement of Jacob in Egypt. For the period of the sojourn in Egypt there existed neither historical chronology nor even history. There appeared indeed, during the period between Joseph and Moses, no personages of sufficient prominence to furnish materials for genealogical registers. They doubled therefore

the previous patriarchal number for the time of the sojourn in Egypt, as a means of indicating its far longer duration, and gave the latter number the form of an historical sum total without the basis of genealogical registers. Parallel with this sum runs—whether of earlier or later origin may be a question—the prophetic announcement of 400 years and four generations.

“This latter form of the tradition is probably connected with the legendary genealogies of particular families, those of the Levites especially. For almost all of them have three or four branches. But whether these were constructed on the basis of that passage, or whether the chronology of the passage was borrowed from them, in neither case can sound criticism here admit the existence of any element of genuine historical chronology.”—pp. 172-4.

This is, in truth, to apply to the interpretation of the Bible the largest and freest measure of rationalistic liberty. Nor is the liberty confined to this, or a few parallel instances. M. Bunsen has no hesitation in applying it to the whole question of the genealogical and chronological bearings of the Bible narratives. The most sweeping rationalist of the school of Tübingen has never applied the test of naturalism to the miracles of the Gospel, more nakedly than Baron Bunsen employs it in reference to this very question, when he declares that it is difficult to imagine how “those critics who admit the personality and power of Joseph, and the immigration of the sons of Jacob, about 70 persons with their servants, as historical facts, and also the scriptural accounts (Numb. i. 46. comp. xxvi. 51.), according to which the fighting men of 20 years and upwards exceeded 600,000 men at the Exodus—it is difficult to imagine how these critics can consider it an historical fact, that the children of Israel should have quitted Egypt as a nation of more than two millions of souls, at the end of 400 or even 200 years after their settlement.”

We cannot of course think, in a short Article like the present, of following M. Bunsen through any part of the investigation by which he professes to arrive at these conclusions. We must be content with briefly pointing out a few of the most glaring of the many arbitrary and untenable assumptions on which his system rests.

From our summary sketch of those sources of primeval Egyptian history on which he relies and on which he builds a scheme subversive of the Bible narrative, it will

be seen that his sole authorities are the monumental inscriptions and the papyri, interpreted and supplemented by Manetho and Eratosthenes. The two last named authors, indeed, may be truly called the foundation of his chronological system.

Now, let it be borne in mind that, as we have already said, the primeval epoch for the minute chronological details of which these writers are accepted as paramount authority, is separated from both of them by an interval of between three and four thousand years. As independent witnesses for these times, therefore, it is needless to say, they cannot possibly be entitled to the least authority, nor is Baron Bunsen's elaborate panegyric of them entitled to the slightest consideration; inasmuch as no personal qualities, however eminent, nor in truth anything short of inspiration itself, would be a guarantee for the independent credibility of a historian writing upon so remote a period.

Of course it is alleged by M. Bunsen that both Manetho and Eratosthenes, but more especially the latter, derived their information from the tradition of the country, from the monuments and inscriptions, and from the records kept by the priests, and from the archives and registers of the temples. But it is plain that this allegation only shifts the question somewhat further back, leaving the substantial difficulty entirely untouched, as a very brief examination will suffice to show.

No sound critic will believe that either the monuments of Egypt such as we know them to have been, or the national traditions however preserved, or the registers and records of the temples, or all these taken together, could possibly have furnished such details of chronology, so exact an enumeration of the order and duration of reigns, and so complete a scheme of dynasties stretching back for near four thousand years, as M. Bunsen wishes us to accept as established.

In the first place, as regards the monuments of particular monarchs, it is notorious that, even were they far more explicit than they really are, they are totally without significance as parts of any general scheme of chronology, and that they cannot possibly throw any light on the date of particular reigns, or the duration of particular dynasties. They do not include any general era, the events of each reign being dated separately, and no single date of any

reign bearing a determinable relation, whether to any other reign or to any common era. The celebrated series inscribed on the tablets of Abydos and of Karnak, in like manner, are insufficient as a clue to general chronology, and even to the chronology of the period comprised within their own record. It is admitted that the names are not arranged in strict chronological order; and it is also admitted that they are incomplete, and probably arbitrary in their arrangement. But even were it otherwise, it is plain that an engraved series of kings, stretching back to a very remote antiquity, is not a whit more authentic, nor entitled to a shade more of independent credibility from the fact of its being sculptured upon stone, than if it were found in a written record of the same date and of similar origin. Either of them, if emanating from an authentic source, might be decisive as to contemporary, or nearly contemporary, reigns and dynasties; but it is plainly preposterous to claim for either any conclusive authority as to names, dates, reigns, or dynasties, at a distance of two thousand years.

The only rational ground upon which any authority for distant events could be attributed, either to the monumental series of kings and the lists of the papyri, or to the historians Manetho and Eratosthenes, is, that they derived their statements from the temple registers and from the other priestly or kingly archives which are believed to have existed in Egypt. This is the foundation of M. Bunsen's theory regarding them. He opens his account of the sources of Egyptian history as follows.

"Herodotus describes the inhabitants of the cultivated portion of Egypt as the best informed or most learned of mankind. In one of his lost works Theophrastus used the same expression regarding them, and evidently also with reference to the high antiquity of their traditions. The reason assigned by Herodotus for so characterising them, is their rigid adherence to these traditions; in other words, the exactness with which they maintained ancient usage and the remembrance of the past. Although there is here no direct allusion to their familiarity with the dates and history of their nation, still it is clear from the whole tenor of the second book, that he had devoted great attention to the historical and chronological tradition, and that even where it appeared to him improbable or barely credible, he yet retained it, as worthy of the serious consideration of his readers.

"*'No Egyptian,'* he remarks (A. 12, 'omits taking account

note of extraordinary or striking events.' Manetho observes, in agreement with all the Greek annalists, that the Egyptians possessed uninterrupted descriptions of their kings from Menes downwards. Herodotus (ii. 99. seqq.) was also acquainted with lists of kings kept by the priests, in which the events and monuments of each reign were recorded: from one of these they read to him the names of 330 kings, successors of Menes (ii. 100.) Diodorus enters more into detail as to the nature of these lists or annals of the priests, although his information, as we shall see, is less accurate. 'The priests,' he says in the introduction to that part of his work which treats of Egyptian history (i. 44.), 'had in their sacred books, transmitted from the olden time, and handed down by them to their successors in office, written descriptions of all their kings,' (from the time of the fabulous monarchs, called heroes, to that of the Ptolemies). 'In these an account is given of every king—of his physical powers and disposition, and of the exploits of each in the order of time.' Artaxerxes in his expedition through the country, carried off these descriptions from the archives of the Temple; Bagoas, his lieutenant, afterwards restored them to the priests for a large sum of money. It was in these 'descriptions,' or at least in works compiled from them, that Theophrastus found his account of an emerald of immense size, which a king of Babylon had on some occasion sent with other objects of great value to a king of Egypt—probably Nechao.

"The lists of Manetho and Eratosthenes, which have come down to us, profess, and with truth, as their own internal evidence shows, to have been derived from these royal annals. In these annals, as we shall see, were entered the names of each king, together with his stature, the date of his reign, notices of its more remarkable events or prodigies, and doubtless of his lineage, birth, and age. Concurrent with them, according to the same authorities, was another source of historical tradition, namely, songs or lays, which do not seem to have been limited to mere popular ballads, but to have comprised also hymns of a purely sacred or sacerdotal character. 'With regard to Sesoösis,' says Diodorus (i. 53.), 'not only is there a disagreement among Greek writers, but the priests also, and those who praise him in their songs, vary in their statements.' Manetho also, in his history of the nineteenth dynasty, according to the extracts of Josephus, to be examined more closely in the sequel, quotes popular legends, which he expressly characterises as such, and the authenticity of which consequently he does not pretend to warrant."—pp. 1-4.

Now this, undoubtedly, looks exceedingly imposing; and, as regards the periods during which this system prevailed in Egypt, it is clear that the records so kept would supply a body of information as reliable as could be desired for most of the purposes of national history and chronology.

Hence for the times of Herodotus, and probably for many centuries immediately preceding his time, it may be reasonably believed that the temple archives and other sacerdotal records contained a detailed and continuous catalogue of the Kings of Egypt, from which it would be easy to construct, for that period, such lists of the royal series as we find in Manetho, and in the Turin Papyrus or the tablets of Karnak or Abydos. But it is a very different thing as regards the remote and legendary period into which the speculations of M. Bunsen carry us back. In order that for these times the temple registers should supply any authority whatsoever, it would be necessary to show that the system of records described by Herodotus and Diodorus, extended back into those times, for which, we need hardly say, there is not a shadow of evidence, or even of conjectural probability. It is true that the lists of the kings which the priests exhibited did reach back into these pretended periods; but they were so palpably fabulous in their character that it is only the most wilful blindness or the wildest credulity that could for a moment regard them as possessing any historical value. The later periods no doubt are genuine and historical in them all; but they all begin with the mythological period; they all extend far back into the region of fable; and (what ought to be fatal to their strictly chronological character, even in the historical period,) the succession is as precisely maintained, the order and duration of reigns is as exactly registered, in the purely fabulous, as in what we know to be the strictly historical, epoch. Thus, to take the authority of Herodotus, as cited by Baron Bunsen. If the priests, as Baron Bunsen takes care to tell, read for Herodotus* "from a papyrus, the names of 330 monarchs, who, they said, were the successors of Menes on the throne;" they also told him with equally minute chronological precision, (what Baron Bunsen does not think it necessary to dwell upon,) that it was precisely "17,000 years before the reign of Amasis that the twelve gods were produced from the eight!" Nor is this a solitary example. In another place† Herodotus says that "from Pan to Amasis the priests counted a still longer time; and even from Bacchus, who is the youngest of the three, they

* II. c. 100. Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, ii. p. 80.

† II. 145. Rawlinson, ii. p. 226.

reckon 15,000 years to the reign of that king." But what is most important of all, as illustrating the true value of those sacerdotal registers which Baron Bunsen makes the foundation of all Egyptian history, and for which he would have us set aside the Bible narrative itself, the priests professed to Herodotus that even in these (plainly fabulous) details the temple records were of infallible authority, "as they have always kept count of the years and noted them in their registers."*

In like manner Diodorus† tells us that the Egyptians kept registers of their kings, beginning with the gods and heroes, and coming down to his own time. And, in point of fact, according to the lists of Manetho, the gods reigned upon earth before men, and his lists include these reigns of the gods. The same is true, (although the series is not complete,) for the list of the Turin Papyrus; and in a word, nothing can be plainer than that these catalogues of the Egyptian kings, can only be regarded in the same light as the similar ancient records of all other nations,—a compound of the historical and the legendary, and that to accept them in their integrity, and to adopt their very earliest details as purely historical, simply because we know the latter portion to be such in the strictest sense of the word, would be to endorse as genuine the wildest fables of early Grecian and Roman, or even of Indian and Chinese history.

And hence, to return to the question of the credibility of Eratosthenes, as founded on the opportunities of research, which his acquaintance with the royal and sacerdotal archives must have supplied;—it is clear that Eratosthenes is, on this ground, entitled to credit, solely to the same extent to which his materials can be regarded as trustworthy. The question must still remain, at what point these materials, that is to say the lists, (which are certainly fabulous in part,) cease to be fabulous, and begin to be historical. In determining this, the authority of Eratosthenes, as such, is simply that of a critic, possessing whatever of weight his own personal qualifications may lend to it; but it is not that of a witness, nor can it be considered history in any legitimate sense of the name. It does not follow that because Livy had access to the *Libri Lintei* we must accept as histo-

* Rawlinson, ii. p. 226. † I. cap. 44

rical his narrative of the early centuries of Roman history ; and the catalogues of the Egyptian dynasties, following out a lengthened succession from Menes down to the Ptolemies, may be not inaptly likened to the Irish chronicles, which carry back their entries with the same unvarying air of serious reality, from the year in which they were written, to the days of Partholanus, in the fourth century after the Flood, and even to those of Cesara, the niece of Noah himself !

We have already disclaimed the intention of attempting, within the very limited space at our disposal, to enter into any of the specific difficulties of Egyptian chronology. But we must briefly notice before we close, one example of M. Bunsen's method of dealing with the ancient authorities, and of his arbitrary manner of reasoning, even upon the vague and uncertain chronological data which they supply.

It is hardly necessary to inform the reader that the scheme of Egyptian history derived from Manetho supposes, according to the account of it given in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, a period of nearly 30,000 years before the Christian era. The difficulty, however, arising from this enormous total, is more apparent than real ; for, upon examination of the items which it comprises, we find that nearly 25,000 years out of the 30,000, belong to a period plainly legendary, inasmuch as *the latest* division of it comprises the period of *Manes and Heroes*. Hence the earlier periods must be classed with the fabulous times of Babylonian, Indian, and Chinese history ; and the only historical difficulty which remains to be explained will regard the time at which history may be supposed to commence, viz., that which dates from Menes, and includes the thirty dynasties of Manetho—a period of about 5000 years. It is unnecessary to advert to the various suggestions which have been made for the purpose of bringing the account of Manetho's dynasties into harmony with the Bible chronology—as for example the hypothesis that several of the dynasties recorded by him were not successive, but contemporaneous, and therefore that the sum of 5000 years, which is obtained by adding together the years of the several reigns, considered as successive, is a grievous exaggeration. Our real object in referring to it is rather to illustrate Baron Bunsen's general method, than to examine this particular difficulty. The Baron's theory

of the age of the world would not be by any means satisfied with the full sum of 5000 years claimed for Manetho's dynasties, considered as successive; nor does he himself in point of fact regard them as such. He claims for the human race a far higher antiquity, arguing upon entirely independent grounds derived from his theory of the growth of language; and according to him the Deluge must be placed about 10,000 years before the birth of Christ, and the creation of man about as much earlier. In accordance with the requirements of this hypothesis, he naturally seeks to throw back the historical period to as early a date as possible, and to make room within the strict limits of history for as large a number of real events and real personages as may be reconcilable with the authorities.

Let us see, then, how he proceeds. According to the transcript of Eusebius, Manetho's account was as follows:*

"The gods reigned		13,900
After the gods reigned the <i>Heroes</i>		1,255
And again <i>other kings</i> reigned		1,817
Then other <i>thirty Memphite kings</i>		1,790
Then other <i>ten Thinite kings</i>		350
Then followed the rule of <i>Manes and Heroes</i>		5,813
Then followed <i>thirty dynasties from</i> <i>Menes to Nectanebo the Younger.</i> "		

It is plain from the order in which these several items succeed each other, that, whereas it is argued by all sound Egyptologists that the historic period begins with Menes, all the items before the thirty dynasties, must belong to the legendary time, as indeed is sufficiently indicated by the very names *Manes and Heroes*, by which the entry before Menes is described.

Not so, however, according to Baron Bunsen. Commenting on Eusebius's account of Manetho, he says:

"The Demi-Gods or Heroes were probably also again divided into two classes—the period of the former lasted 1255 years. Eusebius united the period of the latter to the dominion of the Manes, probably in the way of supplement, having found them necessary to make up the eleven centuries. Those Manes then form the transition to historical Kings, but were not Kings of the Empire of Egypt, for the ancestor of these last was Menes, who

* See Appendix, vol. i. pp 607-8.

united the Upper and Lower Country. They may rather be classed as provincial Princes prior to the union, which raised Memphis to the rank of second city in the Empire, next to the primeval sacred Thebes, and eclipsed Abydos. Menes himself was of the Thinite race, and the Thinites are really the last in our series. Before (or conjointly with them) there were of course Kings of Lower Egypt, and these are here described as Memphites, according to the later mode of expression; inaccurately, however, for Menes was the founder of the city of Memphis. Thus, as the former Thinites were the ancestors of Menes, so were the latter probably the ancestors of the oldest Memphite Kings of the Empire, who, on the extinction of the Thinite race in the male line, at the close of the second century of the history of the Empire, ascended the Throne of Egypt. But in Eusebius 'other kings,' who are said to have reigned 1817 years, precede both those Dynasties of primeval Memphite and Thinite Kings. These were, likewise, it may be assumed, provincial Kings of the primeval history—probably Thebans.

"The following, therefore, may be considered as the substance of Manetho's system—

1. Dominion of Gods in two divisions, the first of which ended with Horus, the second with Bitys	...	...	...	13,900 years.
2. Dominion of Heroes in two divisions	...	...	...	1,255
3. Heroes and Kings of the primeval Race—transition from divine to human history	...	...	...	5,813
4. Purely human history—provincial Princes :				
a. Kings without particular notices (of Thebes ?)	...	...	1817	} 3,957
b. Thirty Memphites (Lower Egypt)	...	...	1790	
c. Ten Thinites	...	...	350	
Sum total				24,925 yrs."

By this ingenious transposition, Baron Bunsen transfers to the *human period* nearly 4000 years. By placing after "the transition from divine to human history" the three items—

Kings without particular notices	...	...	...	1817
Thirty Memphites,	...	...	...	1790
Ten Thinites	...	...	...	350

he gains for his theory no less than 3,957 years !

We need not say not only that there is not the shadow of authority in the original of Eusebius for this transposition, but even that it contradicts the order suggested by the very nature of the case itself. M. Bunsen places

immediately after the gods *Manes* and Heroes, after whom come *human* personages. Now the idea of *Manes* or spirits of *deceased men*, necessarily involves the pre-existence of men upon the earth.

The result, however, falls in most conveniently with his pre-conceived hypothesis, and enables him to conclude that "the following points remain historically certain—that as regards the human period, the old Egyptian tradition recognised historical royal families, and individual sovereigns prior to Menes. They were separated from the divine founders of the nation by the sacred princes of the primeval times, who were said to have reigned several thousand years. No family name however is assigned to their more ancient sovereigns—they may therefore have been elective monarchs, chosen by the Priests—a form still maintained, as remarked in our first chapter, in later historical times. But as regards the purely Mythological Dynasties, there is no reason to believe that Manetho reduced the period of the Gods, still less the whole period prior to Menes, to Sothic cycles, of 1461 years each, or to any other class of Egyptian astronomical periods." (I. pp. 73-4).

We have left ourselves but little space to discuss the very startling facts brought forward by Mr. Leonard Horner, in his paper read before the Royal Society, as to the discovery of remains of pottery in the alluvial soil of the Valley of the Nile, at such a depth below the surface as to suggest the inference that the existence of men upon this earth dates back to a period far beyond what is consistent with the Bible narrative. This is a subject which will come more naturally for discussion at some future time, in connexion with the alleged discovery of "works of art in the drift," by M. Boucher de Perthes, in France,* and by Mr. Prestwich, and several others in England. For the present, in order to show how rash and illogical are the conclusions drawn by Mr. Horner, and unhesitatingly accepted by Baron Bunsen,† it will be enough to state the facts as alleged by M. Bunsen. It will at once appear how far these facts are from warranting such a conclusion.

* *Antiquités Celtiques et Ante-diluviennes.* Paris, 1847.

† Vol. iii. pref. xxvii.

Mr. Horner states that in the course of some borings on the site of the ancient Memphis, the boring instrument brought up from a depth of thirty-nine feet below the surface, a fragment of pottery, which is now in his possession. Now, by Mr. Horner's calculation, the rate at which the alluvial deposit increases at that point of the course of the Nile, is $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches in the century. Hence he infers, that since the presence of pottery supposes the existence of man, and since, in order to account for an accumulation of thirty-nine feet, at least 13,371 must be supposed to have elapsed, the Valley of the Nile must have been peopled by a race of men who had made some progress in civilization from a period between fourteen and fifteen thousand years before the present century.

Now it is hardly necessary to point out how many assumptions utterly unproved, and indeed incapable of proof, are involved in Mr. Horner's conclusion.

In the first place, his calculation of the rate of increase, is made on the assumption that because the upper level of the platform on which the colossal statue of Rameses II. at Memphis originally stood is now 9 feet 4 inches below the surface, therefore the deposit of the Nile has been but 9 feet 4 inches since the date of Rameses II. Now this is clearly false. Such a statue must necessarily have stood considerably, probably several feet, above the general surface of the ground on which it was erected. Even the platform on which it stood must have been much elevated above the general surface, in order to allow for the periodical rising of the river, as well as for architectural effect. Hence the actual depth of deposit must have been considerably above 9 feet 4 inches.

In the second place, Mr. Horner's calculation assumes the rate of increase in the deposit to have been uniform throughout this enormous period of thirteen thousand years; and he excludes the idea of any extraordinary or abnormal inundation or inundations, in the progress of which a much larger deposit may have taken place, and by which in the course of a few years might have been accumulated what in ordinary circumstances would be the work of silent centuries. Such an assumption is, of course, entirely gratuitous. Who can undertake to say that many such abnormal deposits may not have actually occurred?

Again, the argument assumes that the fragment of pottery thus found, must have been present

state by the slow process of deposit. This again is a still more gratuitous assumption. Is it not equally possible that the spot in which this fragment was found, was the site of some ancient well, water-tank, or other excavation? It is notorious that, for the purposes of irrigation, tanks, ponds, and other excavations abounded in the Valley of the Nile from the earliest period. The artificial lake of Moeris is a familiar example, although on the very largest scale, and one of the most elaborate chapters of M. Bunsen's work is devoted to the investigation of the site of this celebrated reservoir. The bottom of such excavations was, of course, many feet below the general level of the plain in which they were situated. Hence an object thrown into such a reservoir at the time at which we suppose the deposit to begin to accumulate, would in reality be many feet below the level of a contemporaneous object on the surface of the plain. Now it is notorious that in such reservoirs the deposit is far more rapid than on the plain, and experience proves that a very short period suffices to fill them up to the general level of the surrounding country. Hence, until it is shown that the spot on which Mr. Horner's fragment was found, was not the site of some ancient excavation, the depth of this fragment below the surface can never be taken as an evidence of the depth of the general level at the date which the pottery was deposited.

And even putting aside these artificial excavations, is it not most natural, that in the various changes which, as is historically certain, the course of the Nile has undergone, and the consequent variations of level within short distances in the same place, the finding of fragments of pottery, and such other evidences of human habitation, at this or that depth, must of its own nature be a most uncertain argument of the time at which it was deposited at this particular level? Is it not perfectly possible, that since the sediment would necessarily accumulate more rapidly in the lower level, we might find within short distances of each other, two relics deposited in precisely the same year, nevertheless at very different depths below the present surface level?

We might easily suggest numberless other equally possible explanations of Mr. Horner's piece of pottery. We shall only add, that, until these and many similar possi-

bilities and probabilities shall have been disproved, his conclusion cannot be deemed worth the fragment of pottery upon which it is founded.

Note to Art. VIII. No. 89.—Appeal in Criminal Cases.

It will be remembered that in our 89th No., we devoted an article to the above subject. The trials of Smethurst and others during the last year have now so fixed attention on it, that we entertain sanguine hopes of soon seeing the views we calmly advocated, on the abstract principles of justice, and without the excitement caused by these trials, enrolled in the Statute Book. It appears that on the first night of the Session Mr. McMahon gave notice of his intention to introduce "a Bill to secure a right of appeal in criminal cases," and on the second day introduced it without opposition, when the Home Secretary made the following observations.

"Sir G. Cornwall Lewis:—The hon. member has correctly stated that there is no intention on the part of her Majesty's Government to oppose the introduction of a bill of this kind. The subject is not one of a political character, and it has attracted of late a good deal of public attention. It is one which, I think, properly deserves the attention of the House, and I trust it will receive the attention of both sides of the House, independent of all political consideration. (Hear, hear.) It is obviously a subject in which no party interest is involved. (Hear, hear.) It is a matter in which the whole community has a common interest. I will not now anticipate the discussion that must occur on the second reading, but I wish it should be understood that in making no opposition to the introduction of the Bill which has been introduced to the attention of the House, I am by no means to be understood as giving my assent to the principles which may be embodied in the Bill."

Sir Fitzroy Kelly, who so long back as 1844, first introduced the subject to the House, has also given notice of another Bill for the same object, and we have reason to think that another Hon. Member has also a Bill in preparation for the same purpose. It will therefore be very extraordinary, if the law do not undergo a thorough revision, and this stain on its general excellence be not removed.

According to the present practice, as exemplified in Dr. Smethurst's case, the Home Secretary, on his own authority, without the power of examining a witness on oath, sets aside the deliberate judgment of a jury, and one of the highest judges in the land. This practice enables a man, who fears to call witnesses in court because they may break down on cross examination, to take the chance of an

acquittal without calling them, and then if he is convicted, to call them, or rather to send their unsworn statements before the Home Secretary, who must run the risk of public odium if he firmly discharges his duty and pays no more attention to these statements than the jury would have paid to the sworn evidence of the parties themselves, if they had been confronted in open court with the witnesses for the prosecution. We advocate this change as much for the sake of preventing the escape of the guilty as of securing the acquittal of the innocent. So far, however, as Mr. McMahon's proposal is concerned, it has, after an important debate, been rejected; and we cannot say that we dissent from many of the objections which were urged against his scheme. The fate of this Bill certainly jeopardizes any probability of any legislation on the subject in the present Session; but we must record our protest against the continuance of the existing system, which throws an undue and unreasonable responsibility on the executive Government, and fails to satisfy the public as to the grounds on which a convict may have received a free pardon; and it would be an abuse of terms to say that a free pardon can ever be equivalent to an acquittal. We incline to support the suggestion of one of our cotemporaries (we think the *Saturday Review*) of allowing a new trial in criminal cases to take place only on the Certificate of the Home Office, that there are grounds for a reinvestigation before a Jury. The result of such a trial would, in our view, remove the main objections to the existing system.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*Hebrew Lyrics*. By an Octogenarian. London: Saunders, Otley and Co., 1859.

Who says that the love for poetry has died out in the country since the introduction of steam? We do not believe that the rapid development of the physical sciences and the consequent growth of material industry have destroyed the poetic element in the national mind. There is, on the contrary, an increasing demand for works of the imagination, and more especially for poetry of a religious character. We cannot say, however, that the supply comes up to the high standard of excellence we have a right, in

an age that boasts so much of its own enlightenment, to exact from our writers of poetry. What shall we say in praise of poetic merit when in "Sea-dreams," his most recent effusion, we find the Poet Laureate imposing upon a too credulous public, verses which possess neither point, nor imagination, nor even beauty of language. From Tennyson we have a prescriptive right to expect glitter at least, if not pure gold. In the present excited state of men's minds, disturbed by rumours of wars and by political passions, it is a wise and profitable work to lead all whom we can influence to the contemplation of calmer and purer subjects. Poetry is one of the agents destined, even in this age, to work out the designs of Him who inspired the Royal Minstrel of the Hebrew race. Religious poetry has had in all ages a marvellous hold on the human heart. We can well imagine how the Psalms of David, grand in their simple force, exercised so potent a sway over the souls of God's chosen people. We always witness with joy and welcome every fresh endeavour to spread abroad and unfold the hidden beauties of the inspired Psalmist. In every succeeding version some remote allusion that has escaped notice, or some casual expression that throws light on an obscure or dubious passage is traced out or more closely examined. Some translators give a strict and literal, and even a bald rendering of the original, while other some, like our author, trusting more to the spirit than to the letter, take a freer scope and indulge in a more varied version with sonorous rhythm and metre. The student of the great Psalmist will be equally grateful to each class of translators, and make use of both the free and the literal version as acceptable guides in his difficult study, for they will bring out, by their contrast, the meaning of the original, and supply mutual deficiencies.

The author of the "Hebrew Lyrics" attributes, in his preface, the failure of so many of his predecessors in the work of a poetic rendering of the Psalms to a too rigid adherence to the letter of the original. However this may be, and whatever the estimate we may form of his own measure of success, it cannot be denied that our author has combined with wonderful energy and indomitable perseverance, an evident relish for his work, which alone could have enabled him to complete his arduous undertaking. What perhaps surprises us most is the enthusiastic ardour infused into every page by one who has reached, as

the title page informs us, but which otherwise we never should have guessed, an almost patriarchal length of days. In this manifest labour of love there is abundant evidence of an elaborate finish, as if the Horatian maxim “*Nonum prematur in annum*,” had been observed by the author, and which an elegant and cultivated mind alone could have bestowed. We regret that our space forbids us giving copious extracts or the entire reproduction of some of the more beautiful of these numerous Lyrics. The following is the commencement of the 53rd Lyric :—

“ What fool is there has inly said,
Or outwardly has muttered,
‘ There is no God, of live nor dead ;
And if not here,
Why should we fear
The threats He never utter’d ?’

“ As senseless doctrine as abrupt
Of dulness detestable.
But man’s grown totally corrupt,
And from the way
Gone quite astray,
A graceless ‘ miserable.’

“ From loftiest pinnacle of Heaven
To Earth’s profound abysses
God looked to see if there was even
One, only one
No ill had done,
But still that man He misses.

“ Nor one there is, through all the length
And breadth of His dominions,
That has not given his health and strength
And faculties
To idolize
Gods of his own opinions.”

We quote, in conclusion, the last stanza of the 17th Lyric, on the desire of amassing the wealth and treasures of the world :—

“ But as for me as I grow old
What pleasure can these give ?
Who long Thy Presence to behold ;
For this alone I live ;

And tho' the present scene would seem
The fever of a fitful dream,
As false as fugitive,
Soon shall it shift to other place,
And I behold Thee face to face."

We can well conceive with what patriarchal benevolence our author regards this generation, which he has watched growing up into strength beneath his eyes, and with what kindness of purpose and piety he has bequeathed to us as a legacy his "Hebrew Lyrics."

II.—*The Cyclopædia of Anatomy and Physiology.* Edited by R. B. Todd, M.D., F.R.S. Five vols. in vi. 8vo. London, 1855—59.

England, which gave Harvey to the world, has hitherto produced no great systematic original work on Physiology. Our best elementary works on this most interesting subject have hitherto been translations out of foreign tongues. Almost the only comprehensive work on physiology which we possess by an Englishman, that of the late learned and accurate Dr. Bostock,* is rather critical and historical than actual and practical. The great Gottingen Professor, Alb. von Haller, is the sun in the physiological firmament of Bostock; he himself had little but certain small chemical researches to add to the current information of his day. Though much longer, more elaborate, and learned, the amount of actual physiological lore contained in Bostock's three volumes amounts, in fact, to little more than may be found in the elegant and compendious *Conspectus Medicinæ Theoreticæ* of Dr. James Gregory of Edinburgh. The time, indeed, had not yet come when a great elementary work on physiology was possible in any country, least of all in England. The world had not yet had the physical revelations of Schleiden and Schwann, of Dutrochet and Liebig; and among ourselves in especial, whilst the northerners were ringing monotonous changes on the purely hypothetical ideas of Cullen, the southerners appeared to find all they required in the shadowy speculations of Hunter. It would seem, indeed, that even great

* *An Elementary System of Physiology*, by John Bostock, M.D. 3 vols. London, 1823. Second Edition, London, 1828.

men are not always an undivided good in this world. Cullen paralysed the genius of Scottish medical inquiry for half a century ; and in London to call in question the dicta or presumed dicta (for, like other oracles, he spoke obscurely,) of John Hunter, was to be guilty not only of an intellectual error, but almost of a moral delinquency. Physiology, indeed, apart from its application to practical medicine, has only of late years formed an essential element in the curriculum of medical study. It used in former times to be but superficially taught in our colleges, under the head of "Theory of Medicine," whilst now, associated with structural or general anatomy, it forms one of the most carefully considered courses in every medical school.

We have had then no original systematic work on physiology in English ; but in the great Cyclopædia, the title of which we have given above, we can boast a series of papers by the most eminent British and some foreign physiologists, on every subject that can interest an inquirer into the nature of the organisms that compose the animal kingdom, and their various and complicated functions,—exhaustive disquisitions on the mechanism and mystery of animal life and being. An Herculean task, truly ! carefully if somewhat slowly achieved ; an enduring memorial to the patience, science, and taste of the editor, the announcement of whose awfully sudden death we read while we are correcting the press ;—a fearful loss to the world of science and medicine. When to that distinguished name we add the names of Alison, Bowman, Allen Thomson, Rymer Jones, M. Dutrochet, W. F. Edwards, Carpenter, Willis, and Owen, as among the number of the contributors, we have done enough to proclaim our own appreciation of the work, and to direct the attention of our readers, and all whom it may concern—and whom does it *not* concern to know by what laws he lives, and moves, and has his being?—to this great national work now happily completed.

INDEX TO VOL. XLVII.

- Academy*, Irish 25.
Adam Bede, extracts 34.
Agriculture in Algeria 308—at the monastery of Staobell 326—and at Jemappes 127.
Algeria, French colony there ill regarded by us 274—its former condition *ib.*—great good doing there by France 276—absolute toleration in religion enforced 278—beauty and wealth of the country 280—relics of ancient Christianity there 282—five races that inhabit it 283—their numbers 290—French government of 302—progress of colonisation in it 303, 313—useful works in 305—recommended to travellers 324.
Assisi, Count, his assassination 206.
Arabs, the, in Algeria 286—the great difficulty of the French 291.
Army, the French 305—its useful accomplishments in Algeria 305.
Bel-Ombre, garden of 307.
Beluga, species of whale in the arctic regions 343.
Board of National Education in Ireland 355—the last of the Catholic bishops gave up his seat in it 358—encourages proselytism 371—regulations permitted which have that effect 373—injustice of their discouragement of conventual schools 381—encourage model schools to the detriment of others 388—admit the giving Protestant religious school books to Catholic children 395—is constituted with a majority of Protestants 397—oppressive to Catholic teachers 400—strike out part of Mr. Keenan's report on the working of the schools in Ulster 405—worthlessness of their justification 406.
Books, notices of 264, 538.
 — given in the Irish national schools 395.
Bourbon, the house of 113.
Bugeaud, Marshal, his exploits in Algeria 304, 319.
Bunsen, Baron, his work upon Egyptian history 501, 505—his comments upon the meagreness of the monumental inscriptions 507, 515—yet tries to supersede by them the Bible history 508—proceeds upon monumental inscriptions, the Papyri and the authority of Manetho 509, 518—his panegyric upon Eratosthenes 520—his version of Bible history 522—how reconciled with his professed respect 523.
 — Baron, his opinions controverted 526, 528—extract from 527—his chronology of the world, 532.
Bureau Arabes 302.
Burke, Sir Bernard 111.
Butler, William Archer, his sermon upon education 353.
Carlyle, Mr., his history of Frederick the Great 132—his sketch of German history 134—his theories 136—extravagances 137—instances, *ib.*—his omissions of facts 146—perversion of judgment 157, 159, 162.
Castren, traveller amongst the Samojedes 333—his reception in one of their tents 336.
Catholics, unfairness shown to them in the education of their children 404—what course they should take in regard to the national education system 435—training schools 436—publication of books 437—should form a Catholic educational society 440.
Ceylon, island of, its natural wealth 448—evidences of its ancient civilization 449—population 450—legends concerning 454—sketch of its history 456—progress of Christianity under the Portuguese 457—the island is assumed by the English 465—immoral conduct of the governor *ib.*—its present good secure government 468.
Christian Brothers, their schools 382.
Church, Catholic, in Portugal 46—the priests entangled with the Free Mason Lodges 47—miserable condition at present 71, 75—men promoted purposely to her disgrace 72—her only hope at present in the people 73—life of her patriarch attempted 77.
Cities of Romagna, their municipal privileges 171—forfeit them by their claim to political independence *ib.*—late revolutions in them effected by foreign ruffians 204, 211—sites recovered of forgotten cities in Algeria 300.
Code Napoleon, the, its effect upon liberty 321.
Colonists in Algeria perpetually interfered with 315.
Commerce, French regulations for in Algeria 308.
Conscription, the, its effect upon the French population 320.
De Dominis, Antonio, life of 97, 99, 100—circumstances leading to his apostasy as described by Dr. Newland 101, 103—resigns his See in favour of a relative *ib.*—goes to England 105—reception there *ib.*—his preferences and avaricious behaviour 107—is entrapped into a recantation 108—returns to Rome 109—insincerity and death *ib.*
Dublin, city of 2—history of 3—Hoey's court 4—Castle street *ib.*—Werburgh street 5—Fish-

shamble street 6—Hell 10—High street 11—
theatres 14—bank 24—Grafton street 23.
Dutch, the, their meanness in Ceylon 458, 460—
their influence contrasted with that of the
Portuguese 462—at home made the Catholics
profitable 1b.—persecuted them in Ceylon 463
Dutch power in Ceylon brought to a close by
the East India Company 464.

Education in Algeria 296—endeavours of states
to get direction of 346—views of Napoleon
concerning it 347—of Louis Philippe 1b.—the
Republic in France grants it liberty 1b.—par-
liamentary debate upon it in 1839, 348.

— in Ireland gradually passing into
the hands of the Catholics 384—mixed system
of falling in the colonies 349—in England the
state has given up its authority over 350—to
be free must be unaided 1b.—how far Ireland
is prepared for this 1b.—extracts from a Pro-
testant sermon upon 353—system of intro-
duced in 1831, 354—opposition of the Catholic
bishops to it 351, 355—objections of the Synod
of Thurles 357—changes in the national sys-
tem of 363—as to combined religious instruc-
tion 1b.—in the books supplied 365—the
interference of priests prevented 370—other
important alterations 376—each Catholic
parent must now lodge separate objections to
each dangerous book 379—is almost entirely
carried on by Protestants 397—the whole
system now forced upon Ireland 421—reforms
absolutely required to make the system
available for Catholics 442.

— in Ireland at present more material
than formerly 438—in some respects de-
teriorated under the national system 439.

— Denominational, objections made to
it 422—arguments in favour of 427.

Egypt, its ancient monuments 502—its history
to be re-written from them 503, 505—great
men who have carried on the investigation
504—meagreness of the inscriptions 507—
antiquity of the use of writing in 509—more
important records 511.

Egyptians, early, possessed books 510—which
have not been preserved 511—the papyri
514.

Elephants 448.

England, the, peace of the country maintained
in it by force 175—her jealousy of continental
powers 276.

— a great appropriator of islands 445—
her obligations to Holland 1b.

English, the, meanness of their conduct in
Ceylon 465

Eratosthenes 520.

Eroetus Papyrus present many curious corroborat-
ions of Scripture 517.

Families, vicissitudes of, how caused in England
and Ireland 112—how in France 113—of the
House of Bourbon 1b.

Faulkner, George 13.

Fahrmers, in Ceylon and in India, the earliest
converts to the Catholic Faith 463.

Foundling Hospitals 39—in Paris 41.

Frederick William, King of Prussia, Carlyle's
description of 146—his directions to his son's
instructors 150—his regiment of giants 154—
his treatment of his son and daughter 155—
of Katte 156—his death 163.

Frederick the Great, his letter upon his mar-
riage 159—rude treatment of his sister 161—
his literary acquaintance 163.

French, the, commencement of their attack
upon Algeria 277—how drawn on to their
present position 1b.—political consequences of
their occupation of Algeria 279—their diffi-
culties 283—mistake to expel the Turks 285—
their influence lessened by the love of revolu-
tion 292—carry their toleration of Mahom-
etanism too far 294—unfaithful to their
own religion 296—their promotion of educa-
tion 297—have made themselves Arabic
scholars 299—their explorations of Arabic
literature 300—their administration of justice
301—their useful works 305—introduction of
gardens 307—encouragement of agriculture
308—regulations of commerce 1b.—thresome
and interfering laws 315—conscription 320.

Gautherot, infallible in finding water 307.

Geese wild, hunting them 339.

Gentry, the Irish, their disappearance in the
years of famine 116—how composed 117—
their character 1b.

Gilbert Mr., 2—his history of Dublin 4, 30.

Greece, kingdom of 84—its parliament 85—the
robber party 86.

Greeks, the, character of 84—their desire of
union and independence 86.

Hatt-i-Humayoon the, its provisions cannot be
carried out 94.

Hell Street in Dublin 10.

Heraldry 125.

Herodotus, new translation of, 506.

Hierarchy, Irish Catholic, their pastoral upon
education 351—have frequently protested
against the changes in the Irish system 356—
conditions they required 1b.—their resolu-
tions refused by the Lord Lieutenant 357—
had never done more than agree to try the
mixed system 358—encouraged by papal
rescript 1b.—protest against vesting schools
385.

High Street, Dublin 11.

Hoey's Court Dublin 4.

Holland, great supporter of protestantism 445.

Horner Mr., his theory from the pottery found
in the valley of the Nile 534.

Infanticide crime of, common in England 39.

Inspectors of schools for the Irish National
Board, unfair selection of them 398.

Instruction religious, introduced in the national
schools at improper times 363.

Ireland, how far prepared to make sacrifices for
free education 350.

Islamism in Algeria 295

Ivory, of bones of primeval animals 341.

Jacobinism, definition of, by Burke 348.

Jemappes, French colony at 327.

Jesuits, their expulsion from Portugal by
Pombal 48—their return 59—again expelled
60.

Jews, held in contempt in Algeria 283.

Julius II., Pope, suppresses the Vicars of the
Church 172.

Justice, courts of, in Algeria 301.

Kabyles the, race inhabiting Algeria 288.

Karnack, Royal series of, description of the
site where it was found 511—controversies
concerning 513.

Karanagh Mr., his work on education, Catholic
case stated 362.

Kober-Kowmia, monument in Algeria 300.

- Lambesa*, ancient city of, 282, 288.
Leo X., puts down tyrannical governors of towns 172.
Lepsius, interpreter of the Egyptian papyri 504.
Library, of Mafra 51.
Lisbon, frightful condition of 48—awful warning 49.
Literature Arabic, translated by the French 299—first notice of any amongst the blacks 299.
McCrith Dr., his capture by Greek bandits 87.
Manetho, Egyptian Philosopher 518—an authority not to be relied upon ib.
Marcedo, Padre Jose de, great loss in his death 75.
Margaret Maullasche, heiress of the Tyrol 142.
Martin of Connemara, family of 118—fate of the last heiress 121.
Martin, Richard 118—extent of his property 120.
Miracles 486, 498.
Motra House 12.
Monasteries, their property always coveted 57—all suppressed in Portugal 58—evil results of this 62—property of, how squandered by the spoilers 63—the income they rendered to the state 69.
Monastery of Albocea, its laxity 50—its former splendour ib.—its library 51—its appearance 52—devastated by the French army 55—its kitchen 53—comfort of its tenantry 67.
Monastery of Capuchins, their excellence 54—of La Trappe at Staohell 325.
Money, immense sums of, lent to the Revolutionists of Portugal by English capitalists 61.
Monks, good landlords and improvers of the country 66.
Moors the, in Algeria 285.
Moeabites, the race inhabiting Algeria 287.
Neville, history of the House of 126.
Newland, Dr., his life of Antonio De Dominis 98—blunder about Bedell 102.
North, Mr., English Governor in Ceylon 465—his 'shameful intrigues' ib.—his correspondence 467.
Oran, road made from it to its harbour 305.
Otho, King of Greece 85.
Palaeologi, the last of the 130.
Papyri, historical, first of the class 514—second Papyrus of the kings 515—Exodus Papyri 517.
Parliaments, Irish 18.
Perkins, the American, his account of the taking of Perugia 236—248.
Perugia, the so-called massacre, compared with parallel cases in England 177—with the six-mile-bridge massacre 182—the Limerick massacre 185—tyranny under which the people of the town suffered 203—attack upon the town by the Papal troops 213—refutation of the calumnies upon that subject 228, 231.
Piracy in Algeria 274.
Pius IX., Pope, secret intrigues against him 174—how encouraged 175—treatment of him by Napoleon 111, 191—at Perugia betrayed by the French and abandoned by the Austrians, 195—the Pope's allocution and remonstrances 198, 223.
Pombal, his enmity to the Jesuits 47—effects of his system upon Portugal 49—evil influence upon the Church ibid.—his death 54.
Popes, the, bound to defend their territories 17 right asserted by Popes Pius VII. and IX. 173—difficulties of their government 176.
Portugal, brief sketch of her modern history 49, 55—Don Pedro placed upon the throne 56—suppression of the monasteries, 58—banishment of the Jesuits 59—the civil wars promoted by the money lenders in London 61—spoliation of Church property 63—ruin of the gentry and the peasants 65.
Portuguese in Ceylon 456, 458.
Powell, Rev. Baden, his "Unity of Worlds and of Nature" 470—denies the inspiration of the Bible ibid.—his views upon the attributes of God 471—upon miracles 472, 484—his opinions upon Scripture 478—of a future life 480—gets rid of the soul entirely 481—views upon the introduction of life 482—upon the death of Christ 490.
Precedents, the English love of 115.
Presbyterians, concessions they have obtained from the National Board of Education in Ireland 402, 404.
Protestants, difficulties in their Christian belief 496—reject miracles 497.
Protestantism, Dutch, its characteristics 446.
Pustocersk, city of 543.
Quizote, Don, his account of his imprisonment in Algeria 275.
Rescript, Papal, of 1841, 358.
Revolutions in France 292.
Road between Bildah and Medeah 306.
Rosse, Earl of, 28.
Rowan Hamilton, publication of his trial 26.
Salmon, in the Petschora 338.
Samojeda, the, nation on this side the Oural mountains 330—formerly visited by the English ibid.—geography of their territory 331—their drunkenness 333—first attempts at their conversion 334—mixture of idolatry with their religion 335—their marriage ceremonies 337—their sports 338—contest with bears 340—their last heathen temple destroyed by the missionaries 341—medical knowledge 342.
Santa Cruz, convent of 69—its fall 70.
Sarsfield, Patrick, Lord Mayor of Dublin 12.
Schools in Algeria 298.
 — non-vested in Ireland 380.
 — conventional, discouraged by the National Board 381—their excellence ibid.—model, under the supreme control of the Board 386—character given to them by a Protestant 387—practical working of them described 389—receive boarders 390—model agricultural schools 393—character of books used in them 394—training schools for Catholics required in Ireland 436.
Schoolmasters, many have left their faith 394.
Senior Mr., his account of Turkey 82, 93—extract from 87.
Sisters of charity 298.
Society, Church Education, content with the mixed system while they have it all their own way 430.
Stanley, Mr., his letter published in 1831, 363, 368, 370.
Stopford, Archdeacon, 357, 369, 374—important alteration procured by him from the National School Board 376—attempted justification 411—his interpretation of the rights of parents 414—attributes underhand dealings to the Board 426.
Synod of Thurles, its resolutions upon the National System of Education 357.

